

Generation of Carbon Monoxide in Compartment Fires

Daniel T. Gottuk
Grant **60NANB1D1176**

Generation of Carbon Monoxide in Compartment Fires

Daniel T. Gottuk

**Virginia Polytechnic Inst.
and State University
Blacksburg, VA**

September 1992
Issued December 1992



Sponsored by:

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Barbara Hackman Franklin, Secretary**

**TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION
Robert M. White, Under Secretary for Technology**

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS
AND TECHNOLOGY
John W. Lyons, Director**

Notice

This report was prepared for the Building and Fire Research Laboratory of the National Institute of Standards and Technology under grant number 60NANB1D1176. The statements and conclusions contained in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Standards and Technology or the Building and Fire Research Laboratory.


THE GENERATION OF CARBON MONOXIDE IN COMPARTMENT FIRES


by
Daniel T. Gottuk


Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of


DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Mechanical Engineering

APPROVED:


R. J. Roby, Chairman


C. L. Beyler


D. F. Cox


D. R. Jaasma


L. A. Roe

September, 1992
Blacksburg, Virginia

ABSTRACT

For the purpose of fire analysis and fire safety engineering, the development of empirical correlations for major species yields in compartment fires has become an important priority due to the inability to calculate these quantities ~~from~~ first principles. Studies of simplified upper layer environments have shown that major species production rates can be correlated with the equivalence ~~ratio~~ in what is known as the Global Equivalence Ratio concept (GER). Due to the simplification in these past experiments, it was not ~~known~~ if the GER concept was valid for compartment fires. Therefore, there was a need to determine if correlations existed between major species yields and the equivalence ratio for actual compartment fires. Since the flow of toxic gases from a room poses a hazard to building occupants, it was also important to determine if correlations for CO yield outside of a compartment on fire exist, particularly when external burning occurs.

A 2.2 m³ test compartment ~~was~~ used to investigate the burning of four fuels (hexane, PMMA, spruce and flexible polyurethane foam) in compartment fires. The test compartment was specially designed with a two-ventilation path system which allowed the direct measurement of the plume equivalence ratio (the ratio of the fuel volatilization rate to the air entrainment rate normalized by the stoichiometric fuel-to-air ~~ratio~~).

Empirical correlations between the upper layer yield ~~of~~ major species and the plume equivalence ratio were shown ~~to~~ exist. The results reveal that the production of CO is primarily dependent on the compartment flow dynamics (i.e., the equivalence ratio) and upper layer temperature. A chemical kinetics study indicated that increased compartment ~~temperature affects~~ upper layer species yields in two ways 1) the generation of species in the plume is changed and 2) oxidation of post-flame gases in the layer is

affected. The correlations developed in the compartment fires were qualitatively similar to those developed by Beyler for simplified upper layer environments. However, quantitative differences existed and are explained by the temperature effect.

The species yields downstream of hexane compartment fires were investigated and compared to upper layer yields. Results showed that ~~downstream~~ CO yields can be correlated to the plume equivalence ratio when taking into account the Occurrence of external burning. When sustained external burning occurred for equivalence ~~ratios~~ greater than 1.7, downstream CO yields were reduced to 10 to **25** percent of the upper layer value. Results are very encouraging in indicating that an ignition criterion based on lean flammability limits is useful in predicting the flammability of upper layer gases in compartment fires. An ignition index value ~~of~~ 1.3 indicated the Occurrence of sustained external burning and, thus, a reduction of CO, for the hexane ~~fires~~ studied.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank ~~Dr.~~ Rick Roby, my advisor, for the guidance he has given me over ~~the~~ last five years. He has provided me with many opportunities to grow not just ~~as~~ a student but ~~as~~ a professional in my field. He has not only been a mentor but has also become a friend.

Thanks also ~~go~~ to ~~Dr.~~ Craig Beyler, who was in many ways my co-advisor, ~~Dr.~~ Larry Roe, Dr. Dennis Jaasma and ~~Dr.~~ Dave Cox for ~~serving~~ on my ~~committee~~.

I wish to express my appreciation for the friendships and laughs to ~~all~~ those who have come and gone in the office, Rik Johnsson, Linda Blevins, Jim Hunderup, James Reaney, Doug Wirth and Michelle ~~Peatross~~. I especially, thank Doug and Linda for the many discussions we have had. I would also like to thank Michelle Peatross for her assistance ~~as~~ an undergraduate and later ~~as~~ a fellow graduate student. We worked closely together and benefitted from one another in tackling many ~~of~~ the common aspects ~~of our~~ projects.

My project would not have been accomplished without the help of the many undergraduate assistants and the technical support at Virginia Tech, especially Danny Lewis, Ben Poë and Frank Caldwell.

Support for this project was provided by the National Institute ~~of~~ Standards and Technology, Building and Fire Research Lab under grant number 60NANB8D0829. I am grateful for their support. I would like to acknowledge ~~Bill~~ Pitts of ~~BFRL~~ for the many discussions we had about the project. It is based ~~on~~ some of his ideas about CO formation that I discuss the temperature effect on ~~fire~~ plume chemistry.

I thank my parents for their continual encouragement and support through the years. I especially thank my wife, Ruth, who has helped me in ~~so~~ many ways, particularly, in the many midnight hours while completing ~~this~~ work. Her love and friendship are beyond words.

Finally, I ~~thank God~~ for the talents and opportunities He has given me to succeed and for the source ~~of~~ strength and comfort that He always provides.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	xvi
 Chapter 1 Introduction	 1
1.1 Motivation.....	1
1.2 Background.....	3
1.3 Previous Work	5
1.3.1 Hood Experiments.....	6
1.3.2 Compartment Fire Experiments.....	12
1.3.3 External Burning Experiments.....	13
1.4 Scope of Thesis.....	14
 Chapter 2 Experiments	 16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 Apparatus.....	16
2.2.1 Compartment	16
2.2.2 Hood and Exhaust System.....	19
2.2.3 Gas Sampling System.....	23
2.2.4 Gas Analysis System	26
2.2.4.1 CO and CO ₂ Analyzers	26
2.2.4.2 O ₂ Analyzer	26
2.2.4.3 Total Hydrocarbon Analyzer.....	27
2.2.5 Data Acquisition System.....	29
2.3 Test Samples.....	30
2.3.1 Selection.....	30
2.3.2 Chemical Characterization of Fuels	30
2.3.3 Characterization of Fuel Samples.....	32
2.4 Test Procedures and Data Reduction	33
2.4.1 Common Experimental Procedure and Treatment of Data	33

2.4.1.1 Equivalence Ratio.....	34
2.4.1.2 Species Yields.....	35
2.4.1.3 Heat of Combustion.....	36
2.4.1.4 Quasi-Steady-State Period.....	37
2.4.2 Upper Layer-Sampled Experiments.....	37
2.4.3 Downstream-Sampled Experiments.....	39
Chapter 3 Results: Chemical Species Production in the Upper Layer	40
3.1 Introduction	40
3.2 Upper Layer Development and Uniformity	40
3.3 Hexane	49
3.4 PMMA	66
3.5 Spruce.....	74
3.6 Polyurethane.....	93
Chapter 4 Discussion of Chemical Species Production in The Upper Layer	109
4.1 Introduction	109
4.2 Comparison to Previous Work	109
4.2.1 Upper Layer Environment and Fire Dynamics.....	109
4.2.2 Transient Nature	116
4.2.3 Layer Composition	131
4.2.3.1 Hexane.....	131
4.2.3.2 PMMA	137
4.2.3.3 Wood	142
4.2.4 Temperature Dependence.....	149
4.3 Chemical Kinetics Study of Upper Layer Gases	150
4.3.1 Procedure	151
4.3.2 Results.....	153
4.3.3 Discussion	162
4.3.3.1 Suitability of Chemical Kinetics.....	167
4.3.3.2 Analysis of Modeling Approach.....	175
4.3.4 Conclusion.....	178
4.4 Comparison of Correlations Between Fuels	179
4.4.1 Carbon Monoxide	179

4.4.2 Carbon Dioxide and Oxygen	184
4.4.3 Smoke.....	184
4.4.4 Combustion Efficiency.....	187
Chapter 5 Carbon Monoxide Production Downstream of a Compartment Fire	192
5.1 Introduction	192
5.2 Experiments.....	192
5.3 Results and Discussion.....	193
5.4 Summary and Conclusions.....	209
Chapter 6 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	211
6.1 Summary and Conclusions.....	211
6.2 Recommendations for Future Work.....	214
References.....	216
Appendix A	220
Appendix B	224
Appendix C.....	240
Vita.....	245

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1.1 Development of a typical two layer compartment fire.....	4
1.2 Cross section of cylindrical hood used by Beyler with dimensions shown on left and gas flows shown on right (figure taken from Beyler [14]).....	7
1.3 Measured CO mass fraction plotted against ϕ_u for a range of constant ϕ_p methane fires under a hood. Figure taken from Morehart [16]	10
2.1 Schematic of the test compartment	17
2.2 Schematic of hood and exhaust system.....	20
2.3 Schematic of smoke measurement device	22
2.4 Schematic of gas sampling system.....	25
2.5 Schematic of total hydrocarbon analyzer.....	28
3.1 Instantaneous upper layer vertical temperature profiles for four hexane fires used to study upper layer uniformity . Profiles correspond to a time midway through the steady-state period.....	42
3.2 Time history of equivalence ratio for each of four fires used in the upper layer uniformity study	44
3.3 Temperature time histones at each comer of the upper layer for fire C of the upper layer uniformity study.....	45
3.4 Comparison of transient CO concentrations sampled at four locations in the upper layer (fires A through D of upper layer uniformity study).....	46
3.5 Comparison of transient CO ₂ concentrations sampled at four locations in the upper layer (fires A through D of upper layer uniformity study).....	47
3.6 Comparison of transient O ₂ concentrations sampled at four locations in the upper layer (fires A through D of upper layer uniformity study).....	48
3.7 Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire	50
3.8 Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.....	51

3.9	Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.....	53
3.10	Upper layer CO₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.....	54
3.11	Upper layer O₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.	55
3.12	Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.	57
3.13	Upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.....	58
3.14	Upper layer normalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.	59
3.15	Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3.....	60
3.16	Transient, upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3.....	61
3.17	Transient, upper layer normalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3.....	62
3.18	Transient, upper layer normalized total hydrocarbon yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3. Steady-state data for all hexane compartment fires is also plotted.....	64
3.19	Unnormalized smoke yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.....	65
3.20	Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire.....	67
3.21	Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires.....	68
3.22	Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.....	70
3.23	Upper layer CO₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.....	71
3.24	Upper layer O₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.....	72

3.25	Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires	73
3.26	Upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires.....	75
3.27	Upper layer normalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires	76
3.28	Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8.....	77
3.29	Transient, upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8.....	78
3.30	Transient, upper layer normalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8.....	79
3.31	Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire.....	80
3.32	Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.....	82
3.33	Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires and Beyler's pine hood fires.	83
3.34	Upper layer CO ₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires and Beyler's pine hood fires.....	84
3.35	Upper layer O ₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires and Beyler's pine hood fires.....	85
3.36	Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.....	87
3.37	Upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.....	88
3.38	Upper layer normalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.	89
3.39	Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95	90

3.40	Transient, upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95	91
3.41	Transient, upper layer normalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95	92
3.42	Unnormalized smoke yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires	94
3.43	Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire.....	95
3.44	Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires	96
3.45	Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires	97
3.46	Upper layer CO ₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires..	98
3.47	Upper layer O ₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires	100
3.48	Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.....	101
3.49	Upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.....	102
3.50	Upper layer nomalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires..	103
3.51	Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3.....	104
3.52	Transient, upper layer normalized CO ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3.....	105
3.53	Transient, upper layer normalized O ₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3.....	106
3.54	Unnormalized smoke yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires	108

4.1	Comparison of average upper layer temperatures for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood	112
4.2	Comparison of average upper layer temperatures for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood..	113
4.3	Comparison of average upper layer temperatures for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood	114
4.4	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a hexane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3 and the steady-state correlation for all hexane fires	119
4.5	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO ₂ yield correlation for a hexane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3 and the steady-state correlation for all hexane fires	120
4.6	comparison between a transient, normalized O ₂ yield correlation for a hexane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3 and the steady-state correlation for all hexane fires	121
4.7	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a PMMA fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8 and the steady-state correlation for all PMMA fires	122
4.8	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO ₂ yield correlation for a PMMA fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8 and the steady-state correlation for all PMMA fires	123
4.9	Comparison between a transient, nomalized O ₂ yield correlation for a PMMA fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8 and the steady-state correlation for all PMMA fires	124
4.10	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a spruce fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95 and the steady-state correlation for all spruce fues.....	125
4.11	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO ₂ yield correlation for a spruce fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95 and the steady-state correlation for all spruce fires.....	126
4.12	Comparison between a transient, normalized O ₂ yield correlation for a spruce fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95 and the steady-state correlation for all spruce fires.....	127
4.13	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a polyurethane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3 and the steady-state correlation for all polyurthane fires	128

4.14	Comparison between a transient, normalized CO ₂ yield correlation for a polyurethane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3 and the steady-state correlation for all polyurthane fires.....	129
4.15	Comparison between a transient, normalized O ₂ yield correlation for a polyurethane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3 and the steady-state correlation for all polyurthane fires.....	130
4.16	Time history of CO yield, equivalence ratio and steady-state time ratio for the spruce fire shown in Figures 4.10 to 4.12 as transient data.....	132
4.17	Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations obtained for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood... ..	134
4.18	Comparison of normalized CO ₂ yield correlations obtained for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.....	135
4.19	Comparison of normalized O ₂ yield correlations obtained for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.....	138
4.20	Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations obtained for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.....	139
4.21	Comparison of normalized CO ₂ yield correlations obtained for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.....	140
4.22	Comparison of normalized O ₂ yield correlations obtained for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.. ..	141
4.23	Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations obtained for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.....	143
4.24	Comparison of normalized CO ₂ yield correlations obtained for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.....	144
4.25	Comparison of normalized O ₂ yield correlations obtained for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.....	145
4.26	Comparison of upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for wood compartment and hood fires	146
4.27	Comparison upper layer CO ₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for wood compartment and hood fires	147
4.28	Comparison upper layer O ₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for wood compartment and hood fires.....	148
4.29	Chemical kinetics model calculated CO concentrations versus plume equivalence ratio for cases run at hood layer temperatures and cases run at compartment layer temperatures.....	154

4.30	Chemical kinetics model calculated CO ₂ concentrations versus plume equivalence ratio for cases run at hood layer temperatures and cases run at compartment layer temperatures.....	155
4.31	Chemical kinetics model calculated O ₂ concentrations versus plume equivalence ratio for cases run at hood layer temperatures and cases run at compartment layer temperatures.....	156
4.32	Model calculated major species concentrations versus time for $\phi_p = 0.91$ and $T = 900$ K.....	157
4.33	Model calculated major species concentrations versus time for $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.....	158
4.34	Model calculated CO concentration versus time at different isothermal conditions for $\phi_p = 0.91$	160
4.35	Model calculated CO concentration versus time at different isothermal conditions for $\phi_p = 1.36$	161
4.36	Comparison of calculated CO concentrations at compartment fire temperatures and compartment fire measurements plotted against plume equivalence ratio.	163
4.37	Comparison of calculated CO ₂ concentrations at compartment fire temperatures and compartment fire measurements plotted against plume equivalence	164
4.38	Comparison of calculated O ₂ concentrations at compartment fire temperatures and compartment fire measurements plotted against plume equivalence ratio,..	165
4.39	Carbon monoxide mole fractions plotted as a function of time for an isothermal plug flow reactor using three reaction mechanisms taken from the literature: A) Dagaut et al.'s methane oxidation mechanism [42], B) Dagaut et al.'s ethylene oxidation mechanism [39], and C) Morehart's mechanism [16]. Solid lines represent reactor temperatures of 900 K and dotted lines reactor temperatures of 1200 K. (Figure taken from Pitts [36]). Dot-dash and dotdot-dash lines represent results of this study using a subset of Miller and Bowman's mechanism at 900 and 1200 K, respectively	169
4.40	Normalized sensitivity Coefficients for key reactions in Miller and Bowman mechanism of CO for a case of $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.....	170
4.41	Normalized sensitivity coefficients for key reactions in Miller and Bowman mechanism of C ₂ H ₄ for a case of $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.....	171
4.42	Normalized sensitivity coefficients for key reactions in Miller and Bowman mechanism of CO ₂ for a case of $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.....	172

4.43	Calculated major species concentrations for $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K using Miller and Bowman mechanism with 12 key reactions (identified in CO sensitivity analysis) updated with rate constant data from Dagaut, et al.'s ethane oxidation mechanism [44]	174
4.44	Comparison of unnormalized CO yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.....	180
4.45	Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.....	181
4.46	Comparison of normalized CO ₂ yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.....	185
4.47	Comparison of normalized O ₂ yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.....	186
4.48	Comparison of combustion efficiency for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.....	188
5.1	Typical time histories of upper layer CO yield and plume equivalence ratio for an underventilated hexane fire with external burning	198
5.2	Typical time histories of downstream CO yield and plume equivalence ratio for an underventilated hexane fire with external burning. This fire had essentially the same initial conditions as the fire in Figure 5.1	199
5.3	The averaged steady-state CO yield plotted against the averaged steady-state plume equivalence ratio for upper layer-sampled fires and for downstream-sampled fires	201
5.4	Typical time history of smoke yield, CO yield and plume equivalence ratio for an underventilated hexane fire with external burning	203
A.1	The volumetric flow rate through the inlet duct based on the CO tracer method versus the calculated flow rate based on the velocity probe output. The data is represented with a least squares linear fit	223

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Physicochemical property data used for the fuels studied.....	31
4.1 Average upper layer temperatures (K) for selected ranges of equivalence ratios for both the compartment and Beyler's hood fires. The standard deviation is shown in parentheses.....	111
4.2 Average CO ₂ and O ₂ yield coefficients for all the fuels tested in the compartment fires and for the similar fuels tested by Beyler in hood experiments. The standard deviation is shown in parentheses.....	136
4.3 Average Combustion Efficiency and Average Ratio of Combustion Efficiency to Maximum Efficiency for all the fuels tested in compartment fires and for the similar fuels tested by Beyler.....	190
5.1 Underventilated hexane compartment fires. ϕ_{ss} is the average steady-state equivalence ratio. ϕ_{flash} and ϕ_{sus} are the instantaneously measured equivalence ratio at the time of initial flashes and at the beginning of sustained external burning, respectively. $\phi_{50\%}$ is the instantaneous equivalence ratio at which a 50% reduction in downstream yield occurs due to external burning. UL designates upper layer-sampled test and designates that no reduction in CO yield was observed.	194
5.2 Calculated ignition index for underventilated hexane compartment fires.....	206
5.3 Instantaneous ignition index at time which sustained external burning	208

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation

Fires in residential and commercial buildings **kill** approximately 6000 and injure 28,000 people annually [1]. A study done in the **United** Kingdom of fire victims showed that over 50 percent of the deaths were directly attributed to carbon monoxide poisoning and that in another **33** percent the **gas** contributed significantly to the cause of death [2]. The importance of the role of carbon monoxide **as** a fire hazard cannot be questioned [3,4].

As a chemical asphyxiant, carbon monoxide deprives the body of oxygen by forming carboxyhemoglobin. Hemoglobin in the blood usually combines with oxygen, however, it **has an** affinity for carbon monoxide **200-300** times greater than for oxygen [5]. Therefore, low levels of carbon monoxide can be hazardous. Concentrations of 2000-2500 ppm can produce unconsciousness in less than 30 minutes, and concentrations above 4000 ppm can be fatal in less than an **hour** [5]. Carbon monoxide levels of several percent are found in building fires. Some large scale fire tests have shown extremely high CO concentrations which would be lethal in a breath (e.g., 8 % in mobile homes [6,7]). It should be noted that what is of most importance is the levels of carbon monoxide that flow out of a burning **room** to adjacent spaces. This is because **many** people who die in fires **are** in rooms remote from the original room on fire.

Although carbon monoxide presents a severe threat to occupants of **a** building on fire, it is not well understood how **this gas** is generated in these complex environments. In the field of fire science, models continue to be developed to understand the growth,

spread and effects of fires. Models are typically used **as** either investigative or predictive tools: **1)** to recreate a **fire** scenario in order to understand the causes of the fire or determine the reasons for hazardous outcomes and **2)** to study varying fire scenarios in the design of building systems. In the second case, models can be used to predict safe egress times or used in the design of sprinkler systems and smoke ventilation systems, to name a few [e.g.,8,9,10]. Reference **11** provides an overview of current models and further references on the subject.

The advances in computers in the past twenty years, have allowed more complex and larger numerical models of building fires to be developed. However, the accuracy of these models is limited since much work is **still** required to understand the underlying physics and chemistry of fire. Although written **six** years ago, reference **12** by Emmons presents a good overview of the aspects of fire science which remain incomplete today. The continued relevance of Emmons' paper today is not an indication of the level of work being done in the area, but rather a sign **of** the complex nature of fire.

The incorporation of detailed chemistry in **fire** modeling is lacking. The complex **fire** environment cannot be characterized sufficiently for the application of chemical kinetics modeling, and equilibrium thermodynamics has also been shown to be inadequate at predicting species concentrations in compartment **fire** environments [13]. Since it is not possible to calculate species concentrations in compartment fires from first principles, experimental correlations need to be developed in order to incorporate the important aspect of carbon monoxide generation in compartment fire modeling.

1.2 Background

A typical compartment fire is illustrated in Figure 1.1. Typically, a **two** layer system is created in which the upper layer consists of hot products of combustion that collect below the ceiling and the lower layer consists of primarily ambient air which is entrained into the base of the fire. As a fire in a **room** develops, it initially burns in **an** overventilated mode similar to burning in the open. Due to the excess air, near complete combustion and little CO formation is expected in this mode. As the **fire** grows, ventilation paths in the room restrict **air** flow creating underventilated (fuel-rich) burning conditions. It is under these conditions that products of incomplete combustion are created, CO being of prime importance. In time, the upper layer descends and can **spill** below the top of **a** doorway or other opening into adjacent areas. As hot, vitiated fuel-rich **gases** flow into adjacent spaces, **air** with high O₂ concentrations can **mix** and create a secondary burning zone outside of the compartment. This is referred to **as** external burning. External burning can decrease human **fire** hazard through the oxidation of CO and smoke leaving the compartment, or increase the fire hazard by incompletely burning unburned fuel to CO.

The common parameters describing **a** compartment fire **are** the fuel burning rate, the **air** flow rate into the compartment and the temperature and gas composition **of** the upper and lower layer. The concept of **an** equivalence ratio **has** emerged as **a** useful tool in describing compartment fires by representing several of the common parameters. Due to the complex interaction between the plume and the upper and lower layers, **a** unique definition for the equivalence ratio does not exist. Two common definitions are presented below.

The upper layer equivalence ratio, ϕ_{ul} , is the ratio of the mass **of** the upper layer that originates from the fuel to the mass of the upper layer that originates from the **air**




Figure 1.1 Development of a typical two layer compartment fire.

stream divided by the stoichiometric fuel-to-air ratio. The plume equivalence ratio, ϕ_p is the **ratio** of the mass of fuel burning to the mass of air entrained into the fire plume normalized by the stoichiometric fuel to air ratio. The two equivalence ratios are not necessarily the same. As a fire grows, the upper layer composition represents a collective time history of products. In a typical fire, where **all air** enters the upper layer through the plume, ϕ_{ul} is the same **as** ϕ_p only during steady burning conditions. If the burning rate of the fire changes quickly compared to the residence time of the **gases** in the upper layer, the upper layer equivalence ratio lags behind the plume equivalence ratio. Another instance when ϕ_{ul} differs from ϕ_p is when additional fuel or **air** enters the upper layer directly. The two equivalence ratios **are** different for **this** case even for steady burning conditions.

1.3 Previous Work

Little work in the literature has been identified that systematically studies the generation of major species in compartment fires. **No** large scale studies have **been** done in which species measurements can be **reasonably** correlated **to** other fire parameters. However, Beyler [14,15], Toner [13] and Morehart [16] separately conducted similar experiments which showed that species composition measurements in simplified fire environments **correlated** well to the equivalence ratio. Tewarson expanded **this** work **by** studying major species production **rates** for wood crib enclosure fires [17]. He found that the species production rates were correlated by using the air-to-fuel stoichiometric fraction (the reciprocal of the equivalence ratio). Correlating the upper layer composition to a characteristic equivalence ratio has become **known as** the Global Equivalence Ratio concept (GER). This section briefly describes the work done to date on the GER concept and discusses the need for further study.

1.3.1 Hood Experiments

Beyler [14,15] was the first to measure major species production rates in a small-scale **two** layer environment. The experiments performed consisted of situating a burner under a one meter diameter, insulated collection hood **as** shown in Figure 1.2. The result was the formation of a layer of combustion products in the hood similar to that found in **a** two layer compartment fire. Except for wood, PMMA (polymethylmethacrylate) and polyethylene, continuous feed gas and liquid burners were used to study a range of fuels. Beyler's PMMA slab stock, **2.5** cm thick, was burned with fuel surface areas **of** 230 to 610 cm². Wood cribs consisted of 3.8 cm thick, 20 **cm** long ponderosa pine sticks with three to five layers each with three sticks per layer [15].

By varying the fuel supply rates and the distance between the burner and layer interface, and consequently the **air** entrainment rate, a range of equivalence ratios was obtained. Layer gases were exhausted at a constant, metered flow rate from the periphery **of** the hood at a depth of 15 **cm** below the ceiling. The general procedure was to allow steady-state burning conditions to develop **so** the layer maintained a constant depth below the 15 cm exhaust flow location. **Gas** samples were then taken **from** the exhaust stream. **Using** a hood-traversing, **gas** sampling probe with an aspirated thermocouple, Beyler observed reasonably well mixed uniform layers both in temperature and chemical composition during the steady conditions.

Beyler's results showed that species yields (*grams* of species produced per gram of fuel burned) correlated very well with the plume equivalence ratio. Beyler tested a variety of fuels **to** study the effect of chemical structure and found that carbon monoxide production for underventilated conditions ranked according to oxygenated hydrocarbons > hydrocarbons > aromatics. Although, different levels of CO were observed for various




Figure 1.2 Cross section of cylindrical hood used by Beyler with dimensions shown on left and gas flows shown on right (figure taken from Beyler [14]).

fuels, the correlations were qualitatively similar. Below an equivalence ratio of 0.6 near zero CO production was observed. Above ϕ_p equal to 0.6, carbon monoxide yield increased with ϕ_p and, for most fuels, tended to level out at equivalence ratios greater than 1.2.

Toner performed similar hood-type experiments but using a different experimental setup [13]. The hood used was a 1.2 m cube insulated on the inside with ceramic fiber insulation **board**. The layer in the hood formed **to** the lower edges where layer gases were allowed to spill out. **Gas** sampling was done using an uncooled stainless steel probe inserted up into the layer. Detailed gas species measurements were made using a gas chromatograph system. The upper layer equivalence ratio was determined **from** conservation of atoms using the chemical species measurements, the composition of the fuel and the metered fuel flow rate. Twenty to 200 kW natural gas flames formed over a 19 cm diameter burner were studied. The layer in the hood was allowed to form and reach a steady condition before gas sampling was performed.

Toner concluded that species concentrations were well correlated to the upper layer equivalence ratio and insensitive **to** temperam for the range studied (**490 to 870 K**). Even though the equivalence ratios were defined differently, the correlations obtained were qualitatively **similar to** the correlations obtained by Beyler for different fuels. However, due to the steady-state nature **of** the **fires**, the plume equivalence ratio equalled the upper layer equivalence ratio for both Toner's and Beyler's experiments. The species concentrations were compared to the calculated **equilibrium** composition of the reactants at constant temperature and pressure. Toner found that the layer composition was modeled quite well by the chemical **equilibrium** composition for very overventilated conditions but not for underventilated conditions.

Morehart [16,18,19] studied similar methane hood experiments using much of the same apparatus as Toner [13] except for a different collection hood. The hood, 1.8 m square by 1.2 m high, was larger than that used by Toner and uninsulated. Morehart showed for his experiments that upper layer species concentrations were insensitive to the plume equivalence ~~ratio~~ but correlated well with the upper layer equivalence ratio. This was accomplished by burning a methane flame under the collection hood and obtaining a steady-state condition, thus, maintaining a given plume equivalence ratio. Air was then injected into the upper layer at a **known** flow rate to establish a steady-state ϕ_{ul} lower than the ϕ_p . By increasing the air supply rate to the upper layer, a range of ϕ_{ul} were established while maintaining a set ϕ_p . Morehart found that for a set plume equivalence ratio, species concentrations changed with the upper layer equivalence ~~ratio~~ in a well defined correlation. Figure 1.3 from reference [16] shows Morehart's measured CO mass fraction plotted against the upper layer equivalence ratio for a range of constant plume equivalence ratios. Toner's results are presented in the same Figure. Note that for Toner's experiments the plume and upper layer equivalence ~~ratios~~ were **equal**.

Although similar, the correlations obtained by Morehart deviated from those obtained by Toner. For underventilated methane fires ($\phi_p > 1.3$), Morehart **observed** lower CO, CO₂ and H₂O and higher CH₄ and O₂ concentrations than Toner. The only apparent differences between experiments was that Toner's layer temperatures were 120 to 200 **K** higher than those observed by Morehart (**488 to 675 K**). Due to the similarity in experimental apparatus except for the hood, Morehart concluded that the temperature difference resulted from having a larger uninsulated hood. The effect of temperature on the layer composition was investigated.




Figure 1.3 Measured CO mass fraction plotted against ϕ_{ul} for a range of constant ϕ_p methane fires under a hood. Figure taken from Morehart [16].

Morehart performed a set of experiments in which he ~~repeated~~ the same burning conditions ($\phi_{ul} = 1.45$) with no air addition, but changed the insulation characteristics of ~~his~~ hood for each test. The results showed that with increasing insulation and, thus, increasing temperature, O_2 and CH_4 decreased with a balanced increase in H_2O and CO_2 . For the range of temperatures observed (500 to **675** K) upper layer oxygen mass fraction decreased approximately 70 percent. As the temperature of Morehart's tests approached that of Toner's, the measured species concentrations approached those observed by Toner. Morehart claimed that CO concentrations remained nearly constant. However, study of his ~~data~~ shows an approximate 20% rise in CO which is the same magnitude of disparity between Toner and Morehart's ~~data~~ at the equivalence ratio tested. Since fires burn more inefficiently with increasing equivalence ratio, it is reasonable to expect that if higher equivalence ratio fuels had been tested under the increasing temperature conditions, that even larger CO increases would have been realized, consistent with the discrepancy with Toner's results.

The hood experiments performed by the previous investigators differ from actual compartment fires in several ways. The hood setup allowed considerable radiation to the lab space below. Conversely, a real compartment would contain most of the radiation, thus, resulting in higher wall and upper layer temperatures. Consequently, higher fuel volatilization ~~rates~~ would be expected for an actual compartment fire. **Also**, the hood setup results in a lower layer which has an infinite supply of ~~air~~ which is neither vitiated nor heated. In a real compartment fire, the ~~air~~ supply is limited by the ventilation openings (doors, windows, etc.) and the depth of the upper layer. The air which is entrained into the lower layer of an actual compartment fire can be convectively heated by hot compartment surfaces prior to fire plume entrainment. Third, the hood

experiments did not include any significant ceiling and **wall** flame jets. These dynamic flame structures enhance mixing of the upper layer in actual compartment fires and extend the flame zone beyond the plume. Lastly, the hood experiment correlations were developed **from** sustained steady-state burning conditions. Actual fires of interest are usually in a continual growth stage, and, thus, quite transient in nature. It was not clear what the effect of more transient conditions would be on the correlations.

1.3.2 Compartment Fire Experiments

The only compartment fire study of the global equivalence ratio concept was performed by Tewarson [17]. Tewarson reported that CO, CO₂ and O₂ yields were correlated well by the air-to-fuel stoichiometric fraction (i.e., the reciprocal of the equivalence ratio). Enclosure fire data was taken from previous work in the literature for cellulosic-base fiberboard and pine wood cribs burned in various compartment geometries, **0.21 to 21.8 m³** in volume with single and dual horizontal and vertical openings centered on the end walls. Additional data was obtained for pine wood cribs burned in a small scale flammability apparatus which exposed the sample to variable external radiant heat flux with either natural or forced air flow from below. All products were captured in a sampling duct where temperature and **gas** concentration measurements were made.

Tewarson plotted CO, CO₂ and O₂ yields versus mass air-to-fuel stoichiometric fractions (i.e., the reciprocal of the equivalence ratio) for wood crib compartment fires [17]. His results show distinct correlations with **good** agreement between data for CO₂ and O₂ from the varied experimental conditions. The CO₂ and O₂ yields **are** relatively constant for equivalence ratios up to about **1.7** and **1.4**, respectively, and then decrease sharply **as** the equivalence ratio increases. The CO yield correlates with the equivalence

ratio but with a fair amount of scatter in the **data**. With increasing equivalence ratio, the CO yield increases and, similar to Beyleis correlation for ponderosa pine, appears to be leveling out to a value of about **1.4** for underventilated conditions.

However, the quality of Tewarson's correlations is compromised by the fact that the air entrainment rate used to calculate the mass air-to-fuel ratio was not measured directly, but rather was estimated from the ventilation parameter, **$Ah^{1/2}$** , where A is the **cross** sectional area and h is the height of the vent. Most enclosure fire work performed to date **has** consisted of compartments with a single ventilation **opening** through which both air flows in and upper layer gases flow out. The two-flow situation and the changing location of the layer interface makes accurate flow measurements difficult. It is also important to note that the elemental composition of the fuel volatiles **used** by Tewarson for the wood was not corrected for char yield. A correction of **this** sort would tend to decrease the calculated equivalence ratio.

1.3.3 External Burning Experiments

No studies have examined the effect of external flames on the levels of products of incomplete combustion flowing from **a** compartment fire. The majority of work that has been published on **the** phenomenon **of external** combustion has **pertained to** the physics of flame projection [20,21,22,23,24]. For example, Bullen and **Thomas** [24] report temperature and size measurements for external flames outside **of** compartment fires; however, they do not sufficiently describe the **origin** of the external flames nor their effect on species yields.

1.4 Scope of Thesis

In general, **good** progress has been made in the development of the global equivalence ratio concept. However, no systematic, instrumented compartment fires have been performed to examine the effects of actual compartment fire behavior on the species yield correlations with the equivalence ratio. Of equal importance, no studies have examined the effect of external burning on the levels of CO exiting a compartment fire.

The goals of **this** study were to 1) determine if correlations exist between species generation rates, primarily CO, and the equivalence ratio for compartment fires and 2) determine the efficiency **of** external flames in destroying downstream CO initially produced within the compartment.

Experiments performed examined the burning of **four** fuels in a 2.2 m³ compartment. The compartment was specially designed to separate the entrained **air** flow into the **fire** plume and the outflow of upper layer gases. **This** allowed direct measurement of the entrained **air rate**. Thus, the plume equivalence ratio was calculated directly from the measured fuel burning rate and **air** entrainment rate. Varying the size of the fuel sample and the exhaust ventilation **opening allowed** a range **of** equivalence ratios to be **obtained**.

The production of species in compartment **fires** was examined by measuring species concentrations within the upper layer for a range of equivalence **ratios**. **Four** fuels (hexane, **PMMA**, spruce and polyurethane) were examined to assess the effect of fuel composition on CO production. A second set **of** hexane fires was **performed** in which species yields were measured downstream of the compartment to examine the effect **of**

external burning that occurred. The phenomenon of external burning was characterized and methods of predicting its occurrence were investigated.

The thesis is organized to first present the work of species generation in the upper layer and then the work of studying external burning, which builds on the first study. Chapter 2 describes the experimental apparatus **used** for all experiments, the selection and characterization of fuels and the test procedures **used** for both studies. The results for the upper layer chemical species production experiments **are** presented in Chapter 3 and discussed in Chapter **4**. Chapter **5** presents and discusses the results for external burning experiments. Conclusions and future recommendations **are** included in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 2

EXPERIMENTS

2.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the experimental apparatus and the test procedures used to investigate the generation of CO both within and downstream of the compartment. The chapter is organized in three main sections: 1) description of the experimental apparatus, 2) physical and chemical characterization of the test samples and 3) discussion of the test procedures and data reduction.

2.2 Apparatus

2.2.1 Compartment

The test compartment, Figure 2.1, was a two level structure consisting of a 1.2 m x 1.5 m x 1.2 m high fire compartment and a 1.2 m x 1.5 m x 0.3 m high air distribution plenum below this fire chamber. The compartment frame was constructed of 0.635-cm-thick 5.08 cm steel angle iron and 5.08 cm bar stock. Fire Master 2.54-cm-thick fire insulation board (Thermal Ceramics) completely covered the interior surfaces of the fire compartment. The air distribution chamber was enclosed with 0.3175-cm-thick sheet steel.

An inlet duct and an exhaust vent provide two ventilation paths in the compartment. A window style exhaust vent was horizontally centered in the front of the compartment with a 20.3 cm soffit. The vent size was varied to produce different




Figure 2.1 Schematic of the test compartment.

ventilation conditions while also assuring that there was only outflow of combustion products. Exhaust vent sizes ranged from 25.4-cm-wide by 15.9-cm-high (404 cm²) to 50.8 x 31.8 cm (1615 cm²).

Since there was only outflow through the exhaust vent, all the entrained air was naturally drawn into the compartment through a 4 m long, 30.5 cm diameter inlet duct which emptied into the air distribution plenum. The air in the plenum was drawn into the base of the fire compartment through thermally shielded vents on each side of the structure. Each vent shield was extended 28 cm in from the side wall and spanned from front to back of the compartment. The top surfaces were covered with fire insulation board. The entrained air rate was measured with a hot film, 0-2m/s linear velocity probe (Kurz model 415) with a claimed accuracy of ± 2.5 percent of the reading. The probe was positioned at the point of mean velocity based on measured velocity profiles. The flow was turbulent and, thus, the velocity profile was quite flat. The probe was calibrated in the experimental setup using a CO gas tracer method discussed in detail in Appendix A.

A 0.3175-cm-thick, 2.54-cm-wide Corning vycor glass window placed vertically down the side of the compartment allowed visual observation of the developing fire. Vycor glass is rated for continuous operation at 1173 C, however, work by Skelly [25] showed that edge-insulated windows crack when temperature gradients of 90 C develop between the center and edge of the glass. Therefore, to prevent the glass from cracking it was secured in place from the inside of the compartment with washers approximately every 10 cm along the edge. This allowed the whole surface of the glass to be heated evenly. The window performed well through all fires and up to temperatures of 1400 K with no loss of integrity.

A **15 kg** load cell (A&D Inc.), with **1 gram** resolution, was used to measure the fuel volatilization rate. To isolate the load cell ~~from~~ the fire, it was placed in the center of the ~~air~~ distribution plenum below the fire compartment floor. A **2.54 cm** aluminum rod with square pieces of aluminum plate perpendicularly attached to each end was used to extend the weighing platform through a **3.2 cm** hole in the floor ~~of~~ the fire compartment. The fuel sample was placed on the top of the extension platform.

Temperature measurements were made with a vertical ~~tree~~ of eight aspirated thermocouples located in the front corner of the compartment. The thermocouple tree consisted of **type K**, 30-gage thermocouples **uniformly** spaced **10 cm** apart **starting** 10cm from the ceiling. The tree was positioned **10 cm** away from the walls to avoid wall jet effects. An unshielded **type K** thermocouple was also positioned at the sampling probe location.

2.2.2 Hood and Exhaust System

A **15 x 15 m** hood positioned over the exhaust vent collected all fire effluent. The hood was exhausted through a **45.7 cm** diameter, instrumented duct ~~fitted~~ with a gas sampling probe, smoke measurement device and ~~an~~ orifice plate, **see** Figure **2.2**. The flow was induced with a **142 m³/min (5000 cfm)** blower downstream of the hood. The volumetric flow through the exhaust duct ~~was measured~~ using ~~an~~ A.S.T.M. designed **30.48 cm (12 in)** inside diameter, sharp edged orifice plate, D and D/2 pressure taps, and **a** Datametrix Model **590** Barocel pressure sensor with a Model **1450** Electronic manometer. The design of the orifice meter and flow calculations were based on the A.S.M.E Research Committee on Fluid Meters report Fluid Meters [26].




Figure 2.2 Schematic of hood and exhaust system.

Gas sampling was done by inserting a probe into the center of the exhaust duct. The probe **was** a 0.635 cm (.25 in) stainless steel tube with 0.3175 cm (0.125 in) holes drilled perpendicularly through the tube every 2.54 cm. The entire gas sampling system is discussed in section 2.2.3.

The smoke measurement device was situated 2.4 diameters downstream **of** the sampling probe and 3.7 diameters upstream of the orifice plate. The smoke measurement device, shown in Figure 2.3, provided extinction coefficients by measuring the attenuation **of** a 670 nm laser beam passed through the exhaust duct. The laser was a 5 mW LDA-1001 diode laser with mini module (D. O. Industries). Oriel neutral density filters and diffusers were placed in front of the photodiodes to balance the output from each device with atmospheric **air** in the duct. From the extinction coefficient the mass optical density and the smoke yield were formulated **as** detailed below.

According to Bouguer's Law, the extinction coefficient, K, can be expressed as follows:

$$K = - (1/L) * \ln (I/I_0) \quad [2.1]$$

where L is the optical path length (**m**) through the attenuating medium, I is the light intensity after passing through the medium and **I₀** is the initial light intensity.

The optical density **per** unit length, D (**m⁻¹**), and subsequently, the mass optical density per unit length, D'_{mass} (m²/g), **are** calculated **as**:

$$D = K / 2.303 \quad [2.2]$$

$$D'_{\text{mass}} = D * Q / G_f \quad [2.3]$$




Figure 2.3 Schematic of smoke measurement device.

where Q is the volumetric flow rate through the exhaust duct and G_f is the fuel volatilization rate [27].

The yield of smoke, Y_s , is defined as the *grams* of smoke produced *per* gram of fuel burned and can be expressed as:

$$Y_s = D'_{\text{mass}} / \xi \quad [2.4]$$

where ξ is the specific extinction coefficient of smoke [27]. The specific extinction coefficient is not a well characterized value especially for underventilated compartment fire conditions. As an approximation for well-ventilated **flaming** fires, Tewarson suggests the following relationship for ξ based on the incident wavelength of light, h , and the density of smoke, p , (a density value of **1.1 g/cm³** is also suggested) [27, 49]:

$$\xi = 3.213 / (h * p) \quad [2.5]$$

In the absence of a detailed characterization **of** the specific extinction coefficient and since a **broad** range of ventilation-controlled fires were investigated, the above relationship was used in **this** work to calculate the smoke yield. The smoke yield measurements were used as relative measurements to compare the burning behavior of various fuels and to determine the effect of external **burning** on downstream yield. Actual yields may be **as** much **as 50** percent low due to the uncertainty associated with ξ .

2.2.3 Gas Sampling System

The upper layer **gas** mixture was sampled **using an** uncooled **0.635** cm stainless steel **tube** placed **13** cm into the compartment through the center **of the** exhaust vent. This location for the probe was chosen after species concentration and temperature

measurements, taken at several locations in the upper layer, showed a reasonably well mixed uniform layer (see section 3.2).

Figure 2.4 shows a schematic of the sampling system. The gas sample was drawn from the compartment or the exhaust duct by Thomas 2107 CA18 diaphragm pumps just upstream of the analyzers. The entire sampling line was approximately 9 m long from the compartment to the analyzers and consisted of 0.635 cm (.25 in), 0.0889 cm (0.035 in) wall stainless steel tubing. Polyethylene, 0.635 cm tubing was used from the main bypass flow meter to the CO, CO₂ and O₂ analyzers and from the exhaust duct probe to the sample selection valve. In order to prevent high molecular weight hydrocarbons from condensing out of the sample, the flow system from the compartment to the total hydrocarbon analyzer was maintained over 130 C with the use of Thermolyne heating tape.

From the compartment, the sample flow to all analyzers was passed through a Balston 915A borosilica glass filter with a 93% retention at the 0.1 micron level. The sample flow to the CO, CO₂ and O₂ analyzers was passed through a -10 C cold trap to condense out water vapor, as required by the instruments. A high bypass flow was used to reduce the sampling response time between the compartment and the analyzers to 15 seconds. This included the response time for the analyzers which was less than 2 seconds for all instruments. The flows to the analyzers were regulated with Matheson flow meters located upstream of the instruments. Atmospheric pressure was maintained in the analyzers by placing all flow controls upstream of the devices and exhausting the flows directly to atmosphere. The flow system to the total hydrocarbon analyzer is described in section 2.2.4.3.




Figure 2.4 Schematic of gas sampling system.

2.2.4 Gas Analysis System

~~Gas~~ analysis primarily consisted of CO, CO₂ and O₂ concentration measurements. ~~Total~~ hydrocarbon measurements were ~~only~~ performed for the last hexane-fueled experiments. Analyzers were calibrated before each experiment with ~~zero~~ N₂ gas and certified span gases.

2.2.4.1 CO and CO₂ Analyzers

Carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide concentrations were measured with individual Beckman NDIR model 880 analyzers with reported accuracies of one percent of ~~full~~ scale (CO: ~~0-1000ppm~~, 0-1%, 0-10%; CO₂: 0-15%, 0-20%). Compartment samples were typically analyzed with the 10% CO range and the 20% CO₂ range. Calibration gases were certified mixtures of CO, CO₂ and N₂ balance at 90% full scale values. The 1000 ppm CO range was used for fires expected to be overventilated and for exhaust duct samples. Measured concentrations were compensated for the water removed based on the assumption that the molar ratio of H₂O to CO₂ at any equivalence ratio is equal to the calculated molar ratio at stoichiometric conditions. ~~This~~ assumption leads to an estimated uncertainty in the calculated wet concentration of 1 to ~~6%~~ of the value ~~as~~ the ~~dry~~ CO₂ mole fraction increases from 0.01 to 0.20. Since the H₂O assumption depends on the measured CO₂ mole fraction, the uncertainty in the wet species concentration increases slightly ~~as~~ the ~~dry~~ CO₂ mole fraction increases.

2.2.4.2 O₂ Analyzer

Oxygen concentrations were measured with a Siemens paramagnetic Oxymat ~~5E~~ analyzer set to a 22% range with a reported accuracy of one percent ~~of~~ full scale. The

sample flow was 1 l/min to the analyzer. Measured concentrations were compensated for the water removed based on the assumption that the molar ratio of H_2O to CO_2 at any equivalence ratio is equal to the calculated molar ratio at stoichiometric conditions.

2.2.4.3 Total Hydrocarbon Analyzer

Total hydrocarbon measurements were only obtained for the last hexane-fueled experiments. The total hydrocarbon (THC) analyzer design is shown in Figure 2.5. A Gowmac model 12-800 flame ionization detector (FID) was used with a Gowmac model 40-900 electrometer to measure the total hydrocarbon concentration on a C_2 basis. The FID required a small sample flow in the range of 20 to 40 cc/min, therefore, a 3.5 l/min bypass flow was incorporated to minimize the response time of the sampling system to the analyzer. The constant sample flow to the analyzer was achieved by maintaining a 1.5 psig pressure at the entrance to a calibrated capillary tube connected to the FID inlet port. Sample flow not sent to the FID was bypassed to the atmosphere through a Matheson flowmeter. The set pressure was maintained with a 0-2 psig Fairchild model 10 pressure regulator placed downstream of the capillary tube. Changes in the capillary flow rate due to changes in gas viscosity were estimated to be within 7 percent based on typical gas compositions from the hexane fires.

The sample line was maintained at 130 C or higher using Thermolyne isolating heating tape and the FID was maintained at 105 C in an oven. Heating the sample line minimizes the effect of water condensation and wall adsorption of higher molecular weight hydrocarbons. Since the FID is insensitive to water, total hydrocarbon concentrations require no correction to obtain wet measurements as do the CO , CO_2 and O_2 measurements. Water was not removed from the sample.




Figure 2.5 Schematic of total hydrocarbon analyzer.

A 40/60 mixture of H₂/He fuel was used for the **FID** to reduce oxygen synergism effects related to samples with varying oxygen concentrations. Ethylene (**4.71%**) was used **as** a calibration gas because it is believed to be more representative of the THC present in the sample than methane, which is typically used. Although the FID response is linearly proportional to carbon atoms for compounds in the same homologous series, methane is a more stable and anomalous compound.

2.2.5 Data Acquisition System

The data acquisition system consisted of a 286 Epson Equity **II** computer and **two** Data Translation 2801-A **boards** with a DT707 and a DT756-Y screw terminal panels. The DT 2801-A boards were used **as** analog **to** digital input **boards** with 12-bit resolution. The boards supported either 16 single ended or 8 differential input channels. Differential inputs were used for all the instruments **connected** to the DT707 to take advantage of common mode noise rejection.

The DT756-Y panel was used for up to 16 thermocouple signals. Since differential inputs are required for thermocouples, the 756-Y **board** was unique in that it converted 16 single ended input channels on the 2801-A board to **16** differential input channels. The 756-Y **also** provided the necessary cold-junction compensation for the **type** K thermocouples used in the experiments.

Data acquisition was performed with a compiled GWBASIC program using Data Translation's PCLAB subroutine library. Data reduction was then **performed** with a **FORTRAN** code written for these experiments (**see** Appendix B).

2.3 Test Samples

2.3.1 Selection

Four fuels were tested: 1) hexane, 2) cast polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA), 3) spruce and 4) flexible TDI-based polyurethane foam. The fuels investigated were chosen to provide a varied selection in order to determine if similar species yield equivalence ratio correlations existed for different fuel types. Additionally, hexane, PMMA and spruce were chosen to establish comparisons between Beyler's yield equivalence ratio correlations [14,15] and those expected in this work.

Beyler burned ponderosa pine as his wood selection. However, due to lack of availability of ponderosa pine, spruce was chosen as most similar in chemical and physical properties. Hexane was chosen as a well characterized liquid fuel. PMMA was selected as a simple thermoplastic fuel which breaks down almost entirely to its monomer as it volatilizes. TDI-based polyurethane, however, is a more complex polymer that does not decompose to simple monomers. Furthermore, spruce represents a complex cellulosic material that decomposes directly from a solid to volatiles and char. Also, polyurethane and wood are common items used in building construction and furnishings.

2.3.2 Chemical Characterization of Fuels

In order to plot the data against the plume equivalence ratio, the stoichiometric fuel-to-air ratio must be defined for each fuel. For hexane and PMMA, the stoichiometric fuel-to-air ratio is simply calculated since the elemental composition of the volatiles is readily known. Table 2.1 shows the physicochemical properties used for the four fuels. The elemental composition of 44.1 kg/m³ flexible polyurethane foam was taken to be CH_{1.74}O_{0.323}N_{0.07} [28]. This composition was also verified by an elemental analysis

TABLE 2.1. Physicochemical property data used for the fuels studied.

FUEL	Volatiles COMPOSITION	$(A/F)_{st}$	k_{CO}	k_{CO_2}	k_{O_2}
Hexane	C_6H_{14}	15.2	1.95	3.06	3.53
PMMA	$C_5H_8O_2$	8.26	1.4	2.20	1.92
Spruce	$CH_{2.473}O_{1.07}^*$	4.72	0.89	1.39	1.10
PU	$CH_{1.74}O_{0.323}N_{0.698}^{**}$	8.83	1.41	2.21	2.05

$(A/F)_{st}$ = stoichiometric air-to-fuel ratio (mass units)

k_i = maximum yield of species i

PU = 44 kg/m³ TDI-based flexible polyurethane foam

* - assumes 25% char

** - does not include nonvolatile filler

performed by Galbraith Labs. A filler ~~accounted~~ for 45 percent of the original weight of the polyurethane and remained ~~as~~ a powder and solid crust after the fire, but had no apparent effect on the composition of volatiles. An elemental analysis, also performed by Galbraith Labs, reported a composition of $\text{CH}_{1.689}\text{O}_{0.731}$ for the spruce burned. The composition of the volatiles was obtained by adjusting the wood composition for ~~an~~ observed average of 25 percent char; resulting in a volatiles composition of $\text{CH}_{2.473}\text{O}_{1.07}$. The char was assumed to be ~~all~~ carbon. To calculate the char fraction, the ~~crib~~ weight was first determined at the time in the fire, after steady-state ~~burning~~, at which the upper layer O_2 concentration started ~~to rise~~ rapidly and the CO_2 concentration was also decreasing sharply. The char fraction was then calculated ~~as~~ the weight remaining at this time divided by the initial crib weight.

2.3.3 Characterization of Fuel Samples

Hexane was burned in 6.4 ~~cm~~ deep circular aluminum pans (0.32-cm-thick) ranging from 15 ~~to~~ 28 cm in diameter. The PMMA samples burned consisted of 0.95 cm and 1.9-cm-thick samples ~~ranging~~ in size from 20x20 cm to 46x46 ~~cm squares~~ (400 cm^2 to 2116 cm^2). These sheets were ignited by igniting hexane-soaked PMMA shavings that were evenly piled on top of the sheet to ~~assure!~~ a rapid ~~uniform~~ ignition, thus, decreasing the time to steady-state burning. Spruce sticks, 3.81 cm square, ~~were~~ burned in fuel surface controlled cribs. Fuel surface controlled means stick spacing is large enough to allow sufficient ~~air~~ into the center of the crib. Therefore, the burning rate is dependant on the fuel surface [29]. Crib sizes ranged from 4 to 7 layers and consisted of 3 sticks per layer for 30.5 cm long sticks ~~and~~ 4 sticks per layer for 45.7 cm long sticks. The cribs were placed on aluminum foil pans and ignited with a ~~thin~~ film of hexane poured into the pan. The moisture content of the wood ranged from 11 to 18 percent with an approximate

average of 14 percent. The square polyurethane samples were 12.7-cm-thick and ranged in size from 30.5 to 45.7 cm on a side. The flexible foam had a density of 44.1 kg/m³ and was not fire treated. Each polyurethane sample was burned horizontally on the square side and ignited with a propane torch on the top center of the sample. In all cases the fuel was supported by the load cell in the center of the compartment 5 cm above the floor.

2.4 Test Procedures and Data Reduction

Experiments were classified as either upper layer-sampled tests or downstream-sampled tests. Upper layer-sample tests were performed for all fuels. The downstream-sampled tests consisted of burning hexane fires under the same conditions as the upper layer-sampled hexane tests. Sampling downstream of the compartment in the exhaust duct provided measurements of the effect of external burning on the yields of CO and CO₂ exiting the compartment compared to the initial yields in the upper layer. For both types of tests data reduction was essentially the same. This section describes the basic calculations and test procedures.

2.4.1 Common Experimental Procedure and Treatment of Data

The general procedure was to set the fuel sample in the center of the fire compartment on the load cell extension platform and to set the exhaust vent size by changing the front fire board panel. The fuel was ignited and the data acquisition system started. Data was collected and stored with the time every 2 seconds. The data acquisition was run past the end of the fire to account for the sample delay between the compartment and the analyzers. Measured delay times were used in the data reduction code to adjust the gas concentration measurements with respect to the instantaneously measured fuel burning rate, entrained air rate and temperature measurements.

During the fire, a video was taken ~~of~~ the exhaust vent flow and ~~any~~ external burning that occurred. Another video was taken through the observation window to record the fire inside the compartment and the upper layer development.

2.4.1.1 Equivalence Ratio

The ~~two~~ ventilation path setup allowed direct measurement of the plume equivalence ratio. The plume equivalence ratio, ϕ_p , is the ratio of the fuel volatilization rate to the ~~air~~ entrainment rate normalized by the stoichiometric fuel to air ratio. Most compartment ~~fire~~ work performed to date consisted of compartments with one ventilation opening in which ~~both~~ inflow and outflow of ~~gases~~ occurred [30,31,32]. Consequently, the entrained air into the compartment could ~~only~~ be estimated ~~from~~ the ventilation parameter $Ah^{1/2}$ [17]. The apparatus used for ~~this~~ investigation allowed the entrained ~~air~~ to be measured directly with the ~~use of~~ the hot ~~film~~ velocity probe placed in the inlet duct and the fuel burning rate was measured directly with the load cell. Based on the ~~air~~ entrainment and fuel volatilization, measurements the calculated equivalence ~~ratio~~ measurements have ~~an~~ uncertainty of ± 10 percent.

A range of equivalence ratios ~~was~~ obtained by varying the exhaust vent size and fuel sample size. The ~~air~~ entrainment rate was primarily a function ~~of~~ the exhaust vent size ~~and~~ remained essentially steady throughout a fire. Therefore, to obtain higher equivalence ratio fires, a larger fuel sample was used or the vent size was decreased. In the case of polyurethane and spruce, the test apparatus proved to be a limitation on the range of equivalence ratios obtained. For the largest sample sizes, only slightly underventilated fires were obtained. The exhaust vent size could not be reduced further because the entrained air velocity would be too ~~small~~ to measure accurately.

2.4.1.2 Species Yields

Beyler [14,15] and Tewarson [17] reported the generation of major species, i , in the upper layer environments in terms of a mass yield, Y_i . Species yields are defined as the **grams** of species produced per gram of fuel burned. The yield (actually depletion) of O_2 is the **grams** of O_2 consumed per gram **of** fuel **burned**. Similar to Tewarson's development the yield was calculated as follows:

$$Y_i = \frac{X_{i,wet} (m_{air} + m_{fuel}) M_i}{m_{fuel} M_{mix}} \quad [2.6]$$

where $X_{i,wet}$ is the corrected wet mole fraction of species i , m_{air} is the mass air entrainment rate, m_{fuel} is the mass **burning** rate, M_i is the molecular weight of species i and M_{mix} is the molecular weight **of** the mixture assumed **to** be that of **air**.

The normalized yield, f_i , is the yield divided by the theoretical maximum yield of species i for the given fuel, k_i . By definition, the normalized yields range from 0 **to** 1 and are, thus, **good** indicators of the completeness of combustion. The conservation of carbon requires that

$$f_{CO} + f_{CO2} + f_{THC} + f_{res.C} = 1 \quad [2.7]$$

where $f_{res.C}$ is the yield of residual carbon, such **as** carbon in smoke or high molecular weight hydrocarbons that condense out of the sample. Normalized yields **are** particularly useful in comparing results between fuel **types**. This is discussed in section **4.4**. Normalized yields, f_i , are reported and discussed as yields. True yields, Y_i , are discussed **as** unnormalized yields.

A simple model for the most complete combustion of a fuel can be represented by the following expressions [14]:

$$f_{\text{CO}_2} = f_{\text{O}_2} = 1 \quad \text{for } \phi < 1 \quad [2.8a]$$

$$f_{\text{CO}_2} = f_{\text{O}_2} = 1/\phi \quad \text{for } \phi > 1 \quad [2.8b]$$

$$f_{\text{CO}} = f_{\text{H}_2} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \phi \quad [2.8c]$$

$$f_{\text{THC}} = 0 \quad \text{for } \phi < 1 \quad [2.8d]$$

$$f_{\text{THC}} = 1 - 1/\phi \quad \text{for } \phi > 1 \quad [2.8e]$$

These yield expressions are plotted with the results for comparison. The ratio of the normalized yield of CO_2 or O_2 to the predicted values of the expressions above is defined here as the yield coefficient, B_{CO_2} and B_{O_2} , respectively. These terms are useful in discussing characteristics of the combustion efficiency; for example, an O_2 yield coefficient of 1 indicates complete utilization of available O_2 . In the case of CO_2 , deviation from the model (as indicated by smaller B_{CO_2}) is a measure of the degree of incomplete combustion.

2.4.1.3 Heat of Combustion

The combustion efficiency, X_c , is the ratio of the actual heat release rate to the maximum theoretical heat release rate for complete combustion of all fuel (water as vapor). The maximum theoretical heat release rate is simply calculated by multiplying the heat of combustion by the fuel burning rate. The actual heat release rate can be calculated from either the generation rate of CO and CO_2 or the depletion rate of O_2 [33]. Due to incomplete combustion and the incomplete utilization of O_2 , the O_2 depletion

method is not as accurate at underventilated conditions and, therefore, the combustion efficiency data presented here is calculated from CO and CO₂ generation.

Ideal maximum combustion efficiency is unity. However, the maximum possible combustion efficiency is considerably lower for underventilated conditions. For equivalence ratios greater than one, available oxygen becomes the limiting factor of how much fuel can be burned. The maximum possible combustion efficiency, $X_{c,max}$, can be expressed as:

$$X_{c,max} = 1 \quad \text{for } \phi < 1 \quad [2.9a]$$

$$X_{c,max} = 1/\phi \quad \text{for } \phi > 1 \quad [2.9b]$$

2.4.1.4 Quasi-Steady State Period

A quasi-steady-state period was identified for each fire during the time at which the equivalence ratio leveled out and, in some cases, about the time at which the equivalence ratio peaked. All quantities were averaged over 20 second periods for most fires of hexane and polyurethane and for 60 seconds for most PMMA and underventilated spruce fires depending on the length of the steady-state period. Typically, the experiments ran for 250 to 1000 seconds (i.e., time from ignition to burn out). The quasi-steady-state nature of the fires is discussed in detail in section 3.3.1. The results presented are quasi-steady-state averages except where otherwise noted.

2.4.2 Upper Layer-Sampled Experiments

Upper layer-sampled experiments were conducted to study the generation of CO in the upper layer of two layer compartment fires. Except for several tests discussed below,

all of the tests were conducted with the **gas** sampling probe placed 13 cm into the compartment through the center of the exhaust vent.

A set of tests were conducted to characterize and to determine the uniformity of the upper layer in the compartment. Due to the quasi-steady-state nature and relatively short burning time of the fires, it was not possible to sample in various locations in the upper layer during a single test. Therefore, a series of hexane fires with the same initial conditions were burned and the upper layer was sampled in a different location for each test.

The initial conditions were chosen to result in a ~~fire~~ with a high equivalence ratio, thereby, encompassing both over and underventilated conditions in one experiment. Each test consisted of 1.19 kg of hexane **burning** in a 23 cm diameter pan with a 25-cm-wide by 16-cm-high exhaust vent. The initial compartment temperature was approximately 30 C for each test. The upper layer was sampled at 4 locations: A) 13 cm in through the center of the exhaust vent, B) in the front right corner, 30 cm in ~~from~~ each wall and 28 cm down from the ceiling, C) in the back right corner, 30 cm in from each wall and 28 cm down from the ceiling and D) in the back right corner, 30 cm in ~~from~~ each wall and 14 cm down from the ceiling. Locations A and B were sampled with probes that extended through the exhaust vent. Since locations C and D were in the back of the compartment, the **gas** sampling probe was inserted through the ceiling instead of through the exhaust duct to avoid passing the probe through the ~~fire~~ plume. An unshielded thermocouple was positioned in each corner of the compartment 30 cm from the walls and at the same depth as the probe. The aspirated thermocouple ~~tree~~ placed in the front right corner provided vertical temperature distributions. The results of this set of experiments is presented in section 3.2.2.

The videos obtained of the upper layer-sampled tests were used to correlate instantaneous equivalence ratios with the time that various modes ~~of~~ external burning occurred. The videos of the interior of the compartment provided times at which layer ignition occurred and measurements of layer depths.

2.4.3 Downstream-Sampled Experiments

Downstream-sampled experiments were conducted to study the effect of external **burning** on the levels of CO leaving the compartment. The downstream-sampled tests consisted of burning hexane-fueled fires under the same conditions **as** the hexane-fueled upper layer-sampled tests. Sampling downstream of the compartment in the exhaust duct provided measurements of the effect of external **burning** on the yields of CO and CO₂ exiting the compartment compared to the ~~initial~~ yields in the upper layer. Smoke measurements during the **periods** of external **burning** were compared to **smoke** levels just prior to the phenomenon.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS: CHEMICAL SPECIES PRODUCTION IN THE UPPER LAYER

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the upper layer-sampled tests for all fuels burned. General observations of layer development are presented and discussed along with the results for the tests designed to examine upper layer uniformity. Results presented for each fuel include a description of the general burning dynamics of the fuel and the correlations between layer composition and the plume equivalence ratio.

3.2 Upper Layer Development and Uniformity

The window in the side of the compartment allowed visual observation of the layer interface. For all fuels, the upper layer quickly formed to a depth below the exhaust vent. The upper layer depth varied depending on the fuel and the time into the fire. The layer formed to a depth corresponding to the top of the fuel source in the case of spruce and polyurethane (70 to 100 cm). For PMMA and hexane, typical overventilated layer depths were approximately 54 cm. For underventilated conditions the layer interface descended to a depth that was about 23 cm above the PMMA and hexane fuel surface (i.e., a depth of 86 cm). The fire plume extended into the upper layer for all fires.

The layer interface was characterized by horizontal flow of upper layer gases toward the plume and, although wavy in nature, there appeared to be no mixing between layers except at the plume. This implies that all air in the upper layer entered through the plume. The layer interface was generally 2 to 5 cm-thick. Visual observation confirmed that a distinct recirculating flow pattern developed in the upper layer due to the buoyant

force of the plume and the establishment of the thermal layer interface. For overventilated fires, the fire plumes were smaller and ceiling flame jets were small or nonexistent. Ceiling and wall flame jets were observed for underventilated fires for all fuels, however, layer burning only occurred for the hexane fires and possibly for several PMMA fires. The occurrence of layer burning was hard to detect for PMMA fires due to excessive smoke build up on the window. For very underventilated hexane fires, layer burning occurred and the upper layer appeared to be engulfed in flame as viewed through the observation window. Upon layer burning, the layer interface became thicker and more turbulent as cellular flame zones appeared along the interface.

A set of tests were conducted to characterize the upper layer in the compartment. Due to the quasi-steady-state nature and relatively short burning time of the fires, it was not possible to sample in various locations in the upper layer during a single test. Therefore, a series of hexane fires with the same initial conditions were burned and the upper layer was sampled in a different location for each test as described in section 2.4.2.

Figure 3.1 shows the layer temperature profiles from the vertical aspirated rake during the quasi-steady-state period for each fire, A, B, C and D. It can be seen that the upper layer is quite uniform during the quasi-steady-state period. The data also shows that the fires were quite reproducible; thus, justifying that data comparison between probe sampling locations can be accomplished with different fires.

It should be noted that in some instances, temperatures deviated up to 20 percent from top to bottom in the layer. This appeared to occur more so during the transition to underventilated conditions and for the overventilated polyurethane and spruce fires. Typically the more underventilated fires for all fuels had uniform temperature distributions. This is attributed to the larger ceiling and wall jets which enhanced mixing




Figure 3.1 Instantaneous upper layer vertical temperature profiles for four hexane fires used to study upper layer uniformity. Profiles correspond to a time midway through the steady-state period.

in the upper layer. Figure 3.2 shows the time history of the equivalence ratio for each of the four fires. The similarity between curves is a second check that the tests are essentially the same considering the turbulent nature of these fires.

The lateral thermal **uniformity** of the upper layer can be seen in Figure 3.3 which shows the temperature time histories at each corner of the upper layer for fire C. This plot is typical for all the fires studied. The upper layer temperature varied within 40 K ~~from~~ corner to corner except at the beginning of the quasi-steady-state ~~period~~. At this time all ~~fires~~ were observed to have a peak elevated temperature ~~of~~ approximately 40 to 100 K higher in the back right corner than in the other corners. Although ~~this~~ peak is not fully explained, this time was observed to correspond to the time just after layer burning started. Typically, the upper layer ~~was~~ characterized by about a 20 K temperature ~~rise~~ from front to ~~back~~ in the compartment. This ~~was~~ due ~~to~~ the fact that the inlet duct ~~was~~ attached to the front of the compartment which created a ~~flow~~ pattern leading to more ~~air~~ entrainment into the front of the fire plume. The plume was observed to be slightly deflected towards the rear of the compartment for all fires.

The comparison of upper layer composition measurements obtained for different sampling locations is presented in Figures 3.4 to 3.6. Figure 3.4 shows the CO concentration for the four ~~fires~~. Considering that the sampling locations were obtained for different ~~fires~~ which ~~vary~~ to some degree, the CO concentration is quite similar between sampling locations; the CO concentration deviates within ± 9 percent ~~from~~ the steady-state average of 3.2 for ~~all four~~ fires.

Figure 3.5 shows the CO₂ concentration time profiles for the four sampling locations. ~~Similar~~ to the CO, there is no appreciable difference between sampling




Figure 3.2 Time history of equivalence ratio for each of four fires used in the upper layer uniformity study.




Figure 3.3 Temperature time histories at each corner of the upper layer for fire C of the upper layer uniformity study.




Figure 3.4 Comparison of transient CO concentrations sampled at four locations in the upper layer (fires A through D of upper layer uniformity study).




Figure 3.5 Comparison of transient CO₂ concentrations sampled at four locations in the upper layer (fires A through D of upper layer uniformity study).




Figure 3.6 Comparison of transient O₂ concentrations sampled at four locations in the upper layer (fires A through D of upper layer uniformity study).

locations. Figure 3.6 also shows that during the quasi-steady-state period the O_2 concentration is independent of sampling location. Therefore, both the temperature and gas concentration measurements show that the upper layer can be considered uniform. Visual observation of the smoke patterns and flow dynamics also suggested a well-mixed layer.

3.3 Hexane

A large range of hexane fires was burned with theoretical heat release rates ranging from 75 to 665 kW. A typical time history of equivalence ratio, and CO and O_2 concentrations for a hexane fire is presented in Figure 3.7. As can be seen by the equivalence ratio, the fire burned slowly at first and accelerated as the temperature of the upper layer increased. A steady-state burning period developed toward the end of the fire and then rapid burnout occurred as denoted by the sudden rise in O_2 and sudden decrease in CO, CO_2 and the plume equivalence ratio. The rapid burnout of fuel is typical of pan fires as the decreasing volume allows the fuel to heat and volatilize more quickly. Shorter steady-state periods were observed for overventilated fires.

The CO concentration is typically near zero (less than 1000 ppm) for overventilated conditions and increases quickly as the fire becomes underventilated. In this case a hazardous level of 3.5 percent CO was maintained during the steady-state period. During the transition to underventilated conditions the O_2 concentration decreases quickly to less than 0.02 percent.

Figure 3.8 shows the average upper layer temperature plotted against the equivalence ratio for each hexane fire. The average upper layer temperature is the average of the top four aspirated thermocouple measurements in the compartment, i.e.,




Figure 3.7 Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire.




Figure 3.8 Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.

about the top half of the enclosure. The temperature rises with increasing equivalence ratio for overventilated fires and levels out to a fairly constant value for underventilated fires. For underventilated fires it was observed that the temperature was dictated by the size of the fire. Primarily all upper layer temperatures less than or equal to 1000 K were for fire with 400 kW theoretical heat release rates or less. Larger fires (> 400 kW) had upper layer temperatures of approximately 1100 K.

The upper layer CO concentrations are plotted against the equivalence ratio in Figure 3.9 for the compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires. Beyler's data is included in all plots of species concentrations for the purpose of future comparison and is not discussed in this chapter. Comparison of correlations between experiments is discussed in section 4.2.3. As can be seen, a clearly defined correlation exists for the compartment fires. For overventilated fires, CO concentrations are below 0.2 percent. With increasing underventilated conditions, fires produced more CO. The peak concentrations observed were over 3.5 percent for fires with equivalence ratios about 3.

Figure 3.10 shows the upper layer CO₂ concentration plotted against the equivalence ratio for all hexane fires. The concentrations are correlated quite well by the equivalence ratio. The CO₂ concentration increases with equivalence ratio for overventilated conditions and peaks at about 11 percent for near stoichiometric conditions. Underventilated fires with higher equivalence ratios produced less CO₂ as more CO was formed.

Figure 3.11 shows the upper layer O₂ concentration plotted against the equivalence ratio for all hexane fires. The upper layer oxygen concentration decreases with increasing equivalence ratio. Low O₂ concentrations (less than 5 percent) were observed for even




Figure 3.9 Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.




Figure 3.10 Upper layer CO₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.




Figure 3.11 Upper layer O₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.

slightly overventilated fires. For very underventilated fires ($\phi_p > 1.5$) all available oxygen is completely consumed by the fire.

The hexane fire normalized CO yields are plotted versus the plume equivalence ratio in Figure 3.12. The figure shows that the upper layer CO yield is well correlated with the plume equivalence ratio. Carbon monoxide yields are near zero for fires with equivalence ratios less than 0.6. Above ϕ_p of 0.6, CO yields start to rise; however, significant levels (> 0.05) are obtained only for underventilated fires. Carbon monoxide yields increase dramatically with equivalence ratio for the range of ϕ_p between 1 and 1.5. For equivalence ratios greater than 1.5 the CO yield appears to level out to an average, constant value of 0.11. The data may also be interpreted as decreasing slightly with equivalence ratio for these highly underventilated fires.

As can be seen in Figure 3.13, the CO_2 yield correlates well with the plume equivalence ratio. The simple model discussed in section 2.4.1.2 is included on all CO_2 and O_2 yield plots for comparison. The CO_2 yield is approximately one for overventilated conditions and decreases proportionately as $1/\phi_p$ with increasing underventilated conditions. A similar correlation is observed for the normalized O_2 yield, Figure 3.14. However, the O_2 yield agrees quite well with the simple model.

Figure 3.15 shows the transient CO yield versus equivalence ratio data for a hexane fire that obtained a steady-state average ϕ_p of 3. The transient data is for the same fire shown in Figure 3.7 and includes data for each sampling time up to the mid point of the steady-state period. The correlation between the transient CO yield and the equivalence ratio is quite good. As can be seen in Figures 3.16 and 3.17, similarly well defined correlations are observed for the transient CO_2 and O_2 yields for the same fire as in




Figure 3.12 Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.




Figure 3.13 Upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.




Figure 3.14 Upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.




Figure 3.15 Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3.




Figure 3.16 Transient, upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3.




Figure 3.17 Transient, upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment ~~fire~~ with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3.

Figure 3.15. The very low CO₂ and O₂ yields at equivalence ratios below 0.2 are not physically representative and are a result of not accounting for the initial air in the compartment before the layer is established. Generally close agreement is seen between the transient data and the model, more so for the O₂ yields. The largest deviation from the model occurs for CO₂ in the range of ϕ_p from 0.5 to about 1.

The transient total hydrocarbon yield data is plotted with the steady-state data in Figure 3.18. The yield of unburned hydrocarbons is near zero for $\phi_p < 1$ and rises with equivalence ratio for underventilated conditions. For the experiments with THC measurements, the yield of residual carbon ranged from 0.04 to 0.3 for equivalence ratios from 0.64 to 3.0, respectively. However, typical values ranged from 0.1 to 0.2. The increase in residual carbon with the equivalence ratio can be partially attributed to the increase in soot formation and possibly loss of higher molecular weight hydrocarbons in the sampling system for the very underventilated fires. Beyler typically observed residual carbon yields of 0.1. Considering the maximum ϕ observed by Beyler was 1.55 these results are consistent when compared for similar equivalence ratios.

The unnormalized smoke yield data is presented in Figure 3.19. Due to the location of the smoke measurement device in the exhaust duct, the measurements reflect downstream smoke yields. In the case of fires with external burning ($\phi_p > 1.7$, see chapter 5) downstream smoke yields are lower than the yield of smoke exiting the compartment. Despite the large scatter in the data, the smoke yield is observed to be constant for overventilated fires at an average of 0.016, and a decrease in smoke yields is observed for fires with $\phi_p > 1.7$.




Figure 3.18 Transient, upper layer normalized total hydrocarbon yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a hexane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3. Steady-state data for all hexane compartment fires is also plotted.




Figure 3.19 Unnormalized smoke yield versus plume equivalence ratio for hexane compartment fires.

3.4 PMMA

Theoretical heat release rates ranged from 30 to 400 kW for the PMMA fires studied. A typical time history of equivalence ratio, and CO and O₂ concentrations is presented in Figure 3.20. As can be seen by the equivalence ratio, the fire burned slowly at first and then accelerated to a steady burning condition. Similar to the hexane fires a steady-state burning period developed toward the end of the fire with rapid burnout of the fuel as denoted by the sudden rise in O₂ and the sudden decrease in CO, CO₂ and the plume equivalence ratio. Overventilated fires were characterized with slower transitions to the peak burning rate.

Similar to the hexane results, the CO concentrations are near zero for overventilated conditions and increase quickly as fires become underventilated. A concentration of 5.6 percent is observed just prior to the fuel burning out. The oxygen concentration approaches zero as CO formation starts to occur. There is no measurable O₂ in the upper layer during the quasi-steady burning period. The increase in O₂ concentration at a time of about 200 seconds is due to the burn out of the PMMA shavings used to ignite the slab.

Figure 3.21 shows the average upper layer temperature plotted against the equivalence ratio for each PMMA fire. Temperatures ranged from 536 to 1412 K for the fires examined. The layer temperature rises with increasing equivalence ratio for overventilated fires and levels out to a fairly constant value for underventilated fires. The scatter in the underventilated temperatures is fairly reflective of the theoretical heat release rates for each fire.




Figure 3.20 Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire.




Figure 3.21 Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires.

The upper layer CO concentrations are plotted against equivalence ratio in Figure 3.22. For overventilated fires, CO concentrations are essentially zero. The data shows the general trend of higher CO production for fires with higher equivalence ratios. However the highest CO concentrations (5.6 and 6.3 percent) were observed for fires with equivalence ratios of about 1.4. These two fires were for the largest sized samples burned, however, the burning rates were approximately half that of other samples of the same size. As a result, the upper layer temperatures were among the lowest observed. The high concentrations are not fully explained.

Figure 3.23 shows the upper layer CO₂ concentration plotted against the equivalence ratio for all PMMA fires. The concentrations are correlated reasonably well by using the equivalence ratio. The CO₂ concentration increases with equivalence ratio for overventilated conditions and appears to peak at 15 percent, slightly rich of stoichiometric conditions.

Figure 3.24 shows the upper layer O₂ concentration plotted against the equivalence ratio for all PMMA fires. The same general behavior is observed as noted for hexane. For overventilated fires, the upper layer oxygen concentration decreases with increasing equivalence ratios and is nearly zero for all underventilated fires.

The normalized PMMA CO yields are plotted versus the plume equivalence ratio in Figure 3.25. The figure shows that the upper layer CO yield is reasonably correlated with the plume equivalence ratio. The correlation is qualitatively similar to the CO concentration in Figure 3.22. For overventilated fires, the yields are negligible (below 0.005). Above ϕ_p of 1.0, CO yields increase with equivalence ratio. The maximum yield observed was 0.3. The higher CO yields for fires with ϕ_p of approximately 1.2 to 1.4 are




Figure 3.22 Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.




Figure 3.23 Upper layer CO₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.




Figure 3.24 Upper layer O₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires.




Figure 3.25 Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires.

partially attributed to temperature as is discussed in section 4.3. These fires had upper layer temperatures (~ 1050 K) that were 150 to 350 K below the fires with yields of about 0.1 and similar equivalence ratios.

As can be seen in Figure 3.26 and 3.27, the CO_2 and O_2 yields correlate well with the plume equivalence ratio for the PMMA fires studied. In both cases, the average overventilated yields are about 1, in agreement with the model. The scatter at low equivalence ratios is due to the low burning rates being of the order of the load cell resolution. The yields decrease proportionately as $1/\phi_p$ with increasing underventilated conditions. The O_2 yield agrees quite well with the simple model, while CO_2 is consistently lower.

Figure 3.28 shows the transient CO yield versus equivalence ratio data for a PMMA fire that obtained a steady-state average ϕ of 1.8. The transient data is for the same fire shown in Figure 3.20 and includes data for each sampling time up to the midpoint of the quasi-steady-state period. Figures 3.29 and 3.30, present the similar transient correlations obtained for the CO_2 and O_2 yields for the same fire as in Figure 3.28. As discussed for hexane the very low CO_2 and O_2 yields are not physically representative and should be ignored. For both species, the transient yield is approximately 0.2 to 0.25 below the expected value of one for overventilated conditions, but agree quite well with the model for underventilated conditions.

3.5 Spruce

Theoretical heat release rates for spruce fires ranged from 71 to 171 kW. A typical time history of equivalence ratio, and CO and O_2 concentrations is presented in Figure 3.31. Spruce-fueled fires burned rapidly after ignition and reached quasi-steady-state




Figure 3.26 Upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires.




Figure 3.27 Upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for PMMA compartment fires.




Figure 3.28 Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8.




Figure 3.29 Transient, upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8.




Figure 3.30 Transient, upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a PMMA compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8.




Figure 3.31 Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire.

burning **periods** which were sustained for some time as the fuel was consumed. As can be seen in Figure 3.31, CO concentrations increase quickly as the fresh surfaces of the crib **start** to burn and then decrease with the equivalence ratio. For the fire shown, CO concentrations are quite high ($> 2\%$) considering the fire barely became underventilated. Consistent with the rapid fire **growth**, the upper layer O_2 concentration decreased quickly early in the fire. As shown in the figure, late in the spruce crib fires the CO concentration **decreased** to near zero and the O_2 concentration rose sharply. At the same time the equivalence ratio started to decrease more quickly. These changes were assumed to **mark** the transition from fuel volatile combustion to char burning. Allowing the fire to continue, lead to incomplete char oxidation and a second increase in CO concentration, in some cases to appreciable levels (> 2000 ppm).

Figure 3.32 shows the average upper layer temperature plotted **against** the equivalence ratio for each spruce fire. Temperatures ranged from 630 to 890 K and increased with increasing equivalence ratio for overventilated fires.

The upper layer CO concentrations are plotted against the equivalence ratios in Figure 3.33. Carbon monoxide **begins to** be formed at equivalence ratios of **0.5** and significant levels are obtained for overventilated fires. The maximum CO concentration observed was **3.7** percent. Figure 3.34 shows the upper layer CO_2 concentration plotted against the equivalence ratio for all fires. **As can be** seen, a distinct correlation exists **as** the CO_2 concentration increases for fires with increasing equivalence ratio. Figure 3.35 shows that the O_2 concentrations are correlated well and appear to be approaching near zero values for underventilated conditions.




Figure 3.32 Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.




Figure 3.33 Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires and Beyler's ponderosa pine hood fires.




Figure 3.34 Upper layer CO₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires and Beyler's ponderosa pine hood fires.




Figure 3.35 Upper layer O₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires and Beyler's ponderosa pine hood fires.

The normalized CO yields are plotted versus the plume equivalence ratio in Figure 3.36 for all the spruce fires examined. The figure shows that the upper layer CO yield is reasonably correlated with the plume equivalence ratio. Carbon monoxide production starts at an equivalence ratio of about 0.5 and the yield increases to substantial levels for overventilated fires. The maximum yield observed was 0.24 which occurred at near stoichiometric conditions.

Figures 3.37 and 3.38 present the normalized CO₂ and O₂ yield data plotted versus the plume equivalence ratio. The CO₂ yields agree with the model reasonably well with an average value of 1 for overventilated conditions. Although there is a reasonable amount of scatter in the data, the O₂ yields correlate fairly well with the equivalence ratio with an average value of 1.1 for overventilated fires.

The transient CO yield versus equivalence ratio data for a spruce fire that obtained a steady-state average ϕ_p of 0.95 is presented in Figure 3.39. The transient data is for the same fire shown in Figure 3.31 and includes data for each sampling time up to the midpoint of the quasi-steady-state period. The transient data shows a clearly defined correlation between the yield and equivalence ratio. Significant production of CO starts to occur at a ϕ_p of 0.7 and continues to increase sharply to a peak value of 0.2.

Figures 3.40 and 3.41, present similar transient correlations obtained for the CO₂ and O₂ yields for the same fire as in Figure 3.39. As discussed for hexane the very low CO₂ and O₂ yields are not physically representative and should be ignored. However, the yields of both species are lower than the expected value of one for overventilated conditions.




Figure 3.36 Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.




Figure 3.37 Upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.




Figure 3.38 Upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.




Figure 3.39 Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95.




Figure 3.40 Transient, upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95.




Figure 3.41 Transient, upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a spruce compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95.

The average smoke yield data for each spruce fire is presented in Figure 3.42 versus the equivalence ratio. There is a **rise** in the yield at very low equivalence ratios, but above a ϕ_p of **0.5**, the yield is relatively constant at an average value of 0.0046.

3.6 Polyurethane

Theoretical heat release rates for polyurethane fires ranged from **36** to **241** kW. A typical time history of equivalence ratio, and CO and O₂ concentrations for an underventilated fire is presented in Figure 3.43. Each sample burned slowly **at** first as the fire grew radially outward from the top center of the sample. As the fire progressed down the sides of the block, the burning rate increased and reached a peak or quasi-steady-state and then decreased relatively slowly. The decrease in the plume equivalence was due **to** the burning rate decreasing as the surface area of the polyurethane block diminished during burning. As the fire engulfed the whole sample, CO concentrations in the upper layer increased quickly and remained high while the fuel burned in the quasi-steady period. The overventilated fires obtained much shorter steady-state **periods**, and in **some** cases, the concentrations merely **peaked** during a 10 second period.

Figure 3.44 shows the average upper layer temperature plotted against the equivalence ratio for each polyurethane ~~fire~~. Temperatures ranged from **628** to 996 K and increased with increasing equivalence ratio for overventilated fires.

The upper layer CO concentrations are plotted against the equivalence ratios in Figure 3.45. Carbon monoxide concentrations were below **0.2** percent for fires with equivalence ratios less **than** 0.8. Above ϕ_p of 0.8, CO concentrations were on the order of 2 percent or higher. A maximum value of **3.8** percent was observed. Figure 3.46 shows the upper layer CO₂ concentration plotted against the equivalence ratio for **all** polyurethane




Figure 3.42 Unnormalized smoke yield versus plume equivalence ratio for spruce compartment fires.




Figure 3.43 Typical time history of species concentrations and plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire.




Figure 3.44 Average upper layer temperature versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.




Figure 3.45 Upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.




Figure 3.46 Upper layer CO₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.

fires. As can be seen, a distinct correlation exists as the CO_2 concentration increases for fires with increasing equivalence ratio. Figure 3.47 shows that the O_2 concentrations are correlated well with the equivalence ratio and are below one percent for underventilated conditions.

The normalized CO yields are plotted versus the plume equivalence ratio in Figure 3.48 for all the polyurethane fires. The figure shows that the upper layer CO yield is reasonably correlated with the plume equivalence ratio. Carbon monoxide production starts at an equivalence ratio of about 0.6 but significant levels are not observed until a ϕ_p of 0.8 and higher. The maximum yield observed was 0.24. The data suggests that the yield may level out to a constant value of about 0.18 for underventilated conditions. Figures 3.49 and 3.50 present the normalized CO_2 and O_2 yield data plotted versus the plume equivalence ratio. The yield data correlate reasonably well with the equivalence ratio showing good agreement with the model.

The transient CO yield versus equivalence ratio data for a polyurethane fire that obtained a steady-state average ϕ_p of 1.3 is presented in Figure 3.51. The transient data is for the same fire shown in Figure 3.43 and includes data for each sampling time up to the midpoint of the quasi-steady-state period. The transient data shows a clearly defined correlation between the yield and equivalence ratio as CO production starts at a ϕ_p of 0.6 and increase with increasing equivalence ratio.

Figures 3.52 and 3.53, present the transient CO_2 and O_2 yields versus equivalence ratio for the same fire as in Figure 3.51. As discussed for hexane, the very low CO_2 and O_2 yields are not physically representative and should be ignored. However, the yields of both species are lower than the expected value of one for overventilated conditions. For




Figure 3.47 Upper layer O₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.




Figure 3.48 Upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.




Figure 3.49 Upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.




Figure 3.50 Upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.




Figure 3.51 Transient, upper layer normalized CO yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3.




Figure 3.52 Transient, upper layer normalized CO₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3.




Figure 3.53 Transient, upper layer normalized O₂ yield versus plume equivalence ratio for a polyurethane compartment fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3.

underventilated conditions both the CO_2 and O_2 yields decrease proportionately with $1/\phi_p$, but O_2 agrees more closely with the model.

The polyurethane smoke yield data is presented in Figure 3.54. The yield is relatively constant for overventilated conditions at an average value of 0.0126. The two underventilated fires had average smoke yields of 0.23 which is approximately twice as high as for the overventilated fires.




Figure 3.54 Unnormalized smoke yield versus plume equivalence ratio for polyurethane compartment fires.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION OF CHEMICAL SPECIES PRODUCTION IN THE UPPER LAYER

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the **results** of the upper layer-sampled experiments that were presented in chapter 3. Discussion of species production in the upper layer consists of comparing the current results to previous work in section 4.2 and then a comparison of the compartment fire correlations obtained for different fuels presented in section 4.3.

4.2 Comparison to Previous Work

Very few systematic studies of species production in compartment fire environments have been performed. Previous work by Beyler [14,15], Toner [13] and Morehart [16] studied the production of species in simplified layer environments created in a hood (**see** section 1.3). However, Toner and Morehart only investigated gaseous fuels which were not investigated in **this** study and, therefore, direct comparisons **are** only made with Beyler's results for similarly tested fuels: hexane, PMMA and wood.

4.2.1 Upper Layer Environment and Fire Dynamics

A main objective of **this** work was to determine the effect of actual compartment fire dynamics on the species yield correlations observed by Beyler for a simplified layer environment. Although a uniform two-layer system was developed in both the hood and compartment fire investigations, the fire dynamics were significantly different. Larger **fires** were burned in the compartment experiments with theoretical heat release rates ranging from 27 to 660 kW compared to 11 to 19 kW for the hood experiments. Although

the larger fires are primarily a result of using fuel samples that were twice as large in surface area as those used by Beyler there is also a temperature dependence on the fuel burning rate.

Table 4.1 presents the upper layer temperature **data** for this study along with the data from Beyler's hood experiments. The **data** is presented for two ranges **of** equivalence ratios for the purpose of comparing the fuels and for comparing the hood and compartment experiments. For each fuel, an average for all underventilated fires is presented and shows that the temperature ranks each fuel in the following order: PMMA > hexane > polyurethane > spruce. The average underventilated upper layer temperatures vary from **13** to **24** percent for the compartment fires contrary to Beyler's hood experiments in which the temperatures agreed within **5** percent of each another for all fuels. The range between an equivalence ratio of 0.5 and **1.5** is of importance in comparing the yield correlations obtained from Beyler's experiments and this study (see section 4.3). Beyler observed average temperatures **from** about **240** to **620** K below those observed for the compartment fires. This difference can be seen in Figures 4.1 to 4.3 which present the average hexane, PMMA and wood upper layer temperature versus equivalence ratio **data** for the compartment and hood experiments. Due to the elevated temperatures in the compartment fires radiant heat transfer **to** the fuel surface is increased resulting in higher burning rates on the order of **5** to 10 g/s **as** compared to **0.5** to **1.5** g/s for Beyler's hood experiments.

A premixed flame exhibits a temperature that increases with increasing equivalence ratio, **peaks** near stoichiometric conditions and decreases under fuel-rich conditions. For equivalence ratios less than one, the addition of **fuel** provides more energy release and an increase in temperature. However, for $\phi > 1$, additional fuel acts as

FUEL	TEMPERATURE (K)	
	$0.5 < \phi < 1.5$	$\phi > 1$
Hexane	970 (83)	1038 (62)
PMMA	1164 (129)	1165 (126)
Spruce+	815 (51)	890 (0)
Polyurethane#	840 (77)	910 (122)
BEYLER :		
Hexane	556 (34)	529 (25)
PMMA	547 (145)	525 (37)
Pine	574 (36)	537 (37)

* $\phi_p > 1$ represents only one fire

$\phi_p > 1$ represents only two fires




Figure 4.1 Comparison of average upper layer temperatures for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.2 Comparison of average upper layer temperatures for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.3 Comparison of average upper layer temperatures for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.

a diluent and a heat **sink** which lowers the flame temperature. **A** diffusion flame burning in the open will burn at near stoichiometric conditions with a nearly constant temperature independent of the fuel supply rate. The temperature **of** the upper layer in a compartment **fire** will reflect the temperature of the fire plume. Since the **fire** plume is a diffusion flame, it in itself is not expected to **significantly** increase the temperature observed in a compartment **fire as** fuel burning rates increase. This assumes the plume burns independently **from** the layer and the entrained gas temperature is a constant, which are reasonable assumptions for the purpose of this discussion. Although the plume is **a** diffusion flame, a relationship between upper layer temperature and the plume equivalence ratio, similar to that of a premixed flame, can exist due to the layer being **a** large thermal reservoir which stores heat **as** the heat release of the **fire** increases with equivalence ratio.

The temperature correlations shown in Figures **4.1** to **4.3** show that temperatures in Beyler's hood layers were fairly constant for overventilated conditions for all fuels. This is an indication that large radiation losses from the upper layer **and** plume controlled the layer temperature even though higher equivalence ratios equate to more energy being supplied by the plume! to the layer. For underventilated conditions, Beyler observed that increasing the equivalence ratio decreased the upper layer temperature similar to the described relationship. The compartment fires studied, exhibited quite different temperature-equivalence ratio relationships than observed in the hood experiments. The upper layer temperature increased with increasing equivalence ratio for overventilated conditions and remained fairly constant for underventilated conditions. The full enclosure apparatus resulted in reduced heat losses from **the** layer, **and thus higher** temperatures which reflect the **increased** energy release with increasing ϕ for overventilated

conditions. The large **thermal** mass of the compartment walls and upper layer was not affected by increased fuel addition during underventilated conditions as indicated by relatively constant temperatures. This is attributed to the fact that the additional fuel mass is negligible compared to the thermal mass of the upper layer environment.

In addition to a significant temperature difference between the hood and compartment fires, the larger compartment fires were observed to have larger ceiling and wall flame jets. More **so** for the underventilated fires, the plume would impinge on the compartment ceiling and spread radially outward. ~~Wall~~ flame jets, extending nearly to the layer, were observed for some compartment fires. This is contrasted by the hood experiments for which no significant flame jets existed. Layer burning was observed for hexane fires both in the hood and these compartment fires. However, when layer burning occurred in the hood experiments the layer could not be contained, thus, resulting in the inability to measure the **air** entrainment rate. Therefore, Beyler's yield-equivalence ratio correlations only include **data** for fires with no layer burning. The correlations identified for the compartment fires, however, do include cases in which layer burning was occurring. Lastly, the compartment fires were much more transient **than** the fires studied by Beyler. The typical concentration and equivalence ratio time histories presented in chapter 3 (Figures **3.7**, **3.20** and **3.31**) showed the transient nature of the fires, which is **also** discussed in the next section.

4.2.2 Transient Nature

Particularly for hexane, since finite fuel sources were used in the compartment study, the fires were expected to be more transient in nature than the hood experiment fires. In order to determine whether the species yield correlations developed were

applicable to transient or steady-state fire environments, the steady-state nature of the fires was investigated by studying the residence time and a steady-state time ratio.

The residence time was defined as the time required for a unit volume of air to move through the upper layer volume and was calculated by dividing a representative upper layer volume by the inlet air volumetric flow rate. Residence times ranged from 3 to 80 seconds. Typically, residence times were 4-10 seconds for hexane and PMMA fires and 15-20 seconds for spruce and polyurethane fires. Beyler's upper layer residence times were on the order of 40 seconds.

A steady-state time ratio was defined as the ratio of the residence time to a characteristic growth time of the fire. Fire growth is directly related to the fuel volatilization rate. Therefore, the ratio of the fuel rate to the derivative of the fuel rate was deemed a representative growth time of the fire. The steady-state time ratios were well below 1.0 for all fires, thereby, signifying quasi-steady-state fire situations. Investigation of individual fires showed that the steady-state ratio decreased below 1.0 at very early times in the fire, thus, suggesting that the fires were of a quasi-steady-state nature almost from the start. Typically, the ratio was well below 0.1 for the steady-state periods over which data was averaged. The steady-state ratio increased over 0.1 and in some cases approached a value of one during the transition from over- to underventilated conditions. However, the ratio quickly decreased as a steady underventilated condition was reached. The assumption is therefore made that the plume and upper layer equivalence ratios are equal during the "steady-state" period and comparison between the hood experiments and these compartment fires are on an equivalent basis. So comparison between the hood and compartment fires provides little information on the effect of transient conditions on the species yield correlations.

To investigate the effect of transient conditions on the species yield correlations, the yield to equivalence ratio relationship was examined for individual fires from the time of ignition to the steady state period. Examples of these transient correlations were included in the results for each fuel in chapter 3. Figure 4.4 shows the steady-state hexane CO yield correlation along with the transient yield versus equivalence ratio data for a hexane fire that obtained a steady-state average ϕ of 3. The agreement between the transient and steady-state correlations is quite good. For the same hexane fire, the CO₂ and O₂ transient yields are compared to the steady-state correlations in Figures 4.5 and 4.6. The correlations agree well. Figures 4.7 to 4.15 present the comparison of the transient species yield correlations to the steady-state correlations for the other three fuels.

For all fuels tested, the transient yield data agrees well with the quasi-steady-state yield-equivalence ratio correlations. However, it can be seen that the transient CO₂ and O₂ yields were lower than the steady-state correlations for some overventilated conditions, typically for $0.5 < \phi_p < 1$. This departure is the result of the transient nature of the fire. As discussed previously, the quasi-steady state periods were characterized as such by the steady-state time ratios less than 0.1 and the observation of species concentrations and the equivalence ratio leveling out. However, during the transition to underventilated conditions in which the equivalence ratio changes quickly, the steady-state time ratio increase over 0.1. Although values of 1 are not obtained, the increase in the steady-state time ratio is indicative of more transient conditions. As a result, the upper layer acts as a collection reservoir in which the species concentrations become time averaged. Therefore, the CO₂ and O₂ concentrations are effectively diluted and, thus, the yields decrease, as the fires grow during the transitory periods.




Figure 4.4 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a hexane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3 and the steady-state correlation for all hexane fires.




Figure 4.5 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO₂ yield correlation for a hexane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3 and the steady-state correlation for all hexane fires.




Figure 4.6 Comparison between a transient, normalized O₂ yield correlation for a hexane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 3 and the steady-state correlation for all PMMA fires.




Figure 4.7 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a PMMA fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8 and the steady-state correlation for all PMMA fires.




Figure 4.8 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO₂ yield correlation for a PMMA fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8 and the steady-state correlation for all PMMA fires.




Figure 4.9 Comparison between a transient, normalized O₂ yield correlation for a PMMA fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.8 and the steady-state correlation for all PMMA fires.




Figure 4.10 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a spruce fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95 and the steady-state correlation for all spruce fires.




Figure 4.11 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO₂ yield correlation for a spruce fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95 and the steady-state correlation for all spruce fires.




Figure 4.12 Comparison between a transient, normalized O₂ yield correlation for a spruce fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 0.95 and the steady-state correlation for all spruce fires.




Figure 4.13 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO yield correlation for a polyurethane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3 and the steady-state correlation for all polyurethane fires.




Figure 4.14 Comparison between a transient, normalized CO₂ yield correlation for a polyurethane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3 and the steady-state correlation for all polyurethane fires.




Figure 4.15 Comparison between a transient, normalized O₂ yield correlation for a polyurethane fire with an average steady-state ϕ_p of 1.3 and the steady-state correlation for all polyurethane fires.

An example of this is seen in Figure 4.16 which presents the CO yield, equivalence ratio and steady-state time ratio for the spruce fire shown in Figures 4.10 to 4.12 as transient data. The fire grew rapidly at first as indicated by the high steady-state time ratios. At 77 seconds the steady-state time ratio fell below 0.1 and the equivalence ratio began to level out at about 0.9 indicating a steady-state burning condition was achieved. Therefore, the transient overventilated CO₂ and O₂ yields are expected to be less than unity due to ϕ_u lagging behind ϕ_p during the rapid growth period from very overventilated ($\phi_p < 0.4$) to underventilated conditions. The transient CO yield is also affected in the same manner as seen in Figure 4.12.

Although more transient in nature, the compartment fires are characterized as primarily quasi-steady in nature and therefore, do not differ significantly from Beyler's hood experiments in this respect. This analysis also shows that the species yield correlations developed for steady-state conditions are representative of the quasi-steady growth periods of these fuels except when very transient conditions occur, such as the transition from over- to underventilated conditions.

4.2.3 Layer Composition

4.2.3.1 Hexane

In general the species yields in the compartment fires correlate very well with the plume equivalence ratio as was seen in the results of Chapter 3. Comparison of these compartment fire yield correlations to those obtained from the hood fires of Beyler are discussed below for each fuel.




Figure 4.16 Time history of CO yield, equivalence ratio and steady-state time ratio for the spruce fire shown in Figures 4.10 to 4.12 as transient data.

Figure 4.17 shows the CO yield correlations obtained from both the compartment fires and Beyler's hood fires. As can be seen for the compartment fires, CO yields are near zero for fires with equivalence ratios less than 0.6. Above ϕ_p of 0.6, CO production starts to occur; however, significant levels are obtained only for underventilated fires. This is illustrated in Figure 3.9 which shows CO concentrations under 2000 ppm for overventilated fires. Beyler's CO yields begin to rise at about the same equivalence ratio, but are considerably higher for fires with ϕ_p up to about 1.3. Although qualitatively similar, the differences between correlations leads to a significant different hazard assessment for overventilated and slightly underventilated fires. Similarly for both types of experiments, CO yields appear to level out for very underventilated fires. The CO yield approaches a value of 0.9 for the hood fires, and clearly levels out to an average of 0.11 for the compartment fires.

The normalized CO₂ and O₂ yield correlations are presented in Figures 4.18 and 4.19 for the compartment and hood hexane fires. The compartment CO₂ and O₂ normalized yields agree more closely with the model than the hood data. Departure from the model is represented by the yield coefficient, which is the yield divided by the predicted value. As can be seen in Figure 4.18, the CO₂ yield coefficient, B_{CO_2} , increases only slightly with equivalence ratio and can be represented as an average of 0.83 for $\phi > 1$. The hood fires are characterized with an average B_{CO_2} of 0.61 which also is quite independent of ϕ_p , for $\phi_p > 1$. Table 4.2 presents the average yield coefficients for all the fuels tested, including Beyler's data.

The compartment fires exhibited nearly complete utilization of O₂ (B_{O_2} of 0.96), whereas, the hood fires were less efficient with an average yield coefficient, B_{O_2} , of 0.82 for $\phi > 1$. This is also illustrated in Figure 3.11 which shows typically 1 percent to no




Figure 4.17 Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations obtained for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.18 Comparison of normalized CO₂ yield correlations obtained for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.

Table 4.2 Average CO₂ and O₂ yield coefficients for all the fuels tested in the compartment fires and for the similar fuels tested by Beyler in hood' experiments. The standard deviation is shown in parentheses.

FUEL	B _{CO2}		B _{O2}	
	$\phi < 1$	$\phi > 1$	$\phi < 1$	$\phi > 1$
Hexane	0.93 (0.08)	0.83 (0.05)	0.95 (0.09)	0.96 (0.06)
PMMA	0.99 (0.09)	0.93 (0.04)	1.06 (0.14)	0.98 (0.04)
Spruce*	0.99 (0.09)	0.90 (0)	1.05 (0.13)	0.95 (0)
Polyurethane#	0.90 (0.10)	0.87 (0.04)	1.02 (0.09)	0.97 (0.02)
BEYLER :				
Hexane	0.82 (0.07)	0.61 (0.10)	0.92 (0.04)	0.82 (0.02)
PMMA	0.83 (0.10)	0.77 (0.06)	0.90 (0.07)	0.92 (0.19)
Ponderosa Pine	0.92 (0.08)	0.85 (0.05)	0.93 (0.10)	0.89 (0.03)

* $\phi_p > 1$ represents only one fire

$\phi_p > 1$ represents only two fires

measurable O_2 in the compartment upper layers for underventilated fires and about 3 percent O_2 for the hood fires. For fires with available O_2 in the upper layer (i.e. $\phi_p \leq 1.5$) combustion is more complete in the compartment apparatus as indicated by the lower CO and higher CO_2 yields than in the hood experiments. As can be seen in Figure 4.19, full utilization of O_2 in the compartment fires occurs for $\phi_p > 1.5$. It is for these same fires that the CO yield plateaus. With the fact that B_{CO_2} does not decrease, this indicates that the additional fuel does not contribute to the chemistry of the fire but **only** increases the yield of unburned hydrocarbons. The **data** bears this out, as measured total hydrocarbon production increases with increasing equivalence **ratio**.

4.2.3.2 PMMA

The comparison between PMMA yield correlations obtained from the compartment and the hood experiments is quite **similar** to that of hexane. Figure 4.20 presents the normalized CO yield correlations for both the compartment and hood experiments. In the compartment fires, CO yields **are** near zero for overventilated fires and increase with increasing underventilated conditions. Typically, Beyler observed higher CO yields than in **this** study for fires with $\phi \leq 1.3$. **Similar** to the hood hexane correlation, Beyler observed quite high yields for overventilated fires, in contrast to virtually no CO production in the compartment. Beyler's results **also** show the yield leveling **off** to a value of about **0.14**, which is **30** to 50 percent lower than the yields observed for the underventilated compartment fires. Carbon monoxide levels **as** high as **6.3** percent by volume were observed for the compartment fires, approximately twice that observed by Beyler.

As can be seen in Figures 4.21 and 4.22, the compartment CO_2 and O_2 normalized yields for PMMA agree better with the model than does the hood **data**. The compartment




Figure 4.19 Comparison of normalized O₂ yield correlations obtained for hexane fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.20 Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations obtained for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.21 Comparison of normalized CO₂ yield correlations obtained for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.22 Comparison of normalized O₂ yield correlations obtained for PMMA fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.

fires exhibited nearly complete utilization of O_2 , whereas, the hood fires were less efficient with an average O_2 yield coefficient of 0.92 for $\phi > 1$ compared to **0.98** for the compartment tests.

4.2.3.3 Wood

Unlike the hexane and PMMA comparisons, the wood yield correlations are relatively the same between the hood and compartment fires. As can be seen in Figure **4.23**, CO yields begin to rise about an equivalence ratio of **0.6** for both the compartment and hood environments. However, higher CO yields were observed in the compartment than in the hood upper layers. Beyler observed CO yields leveling out at an average of **0.155** which is about two-thirds of the maximum yield observed in the compartment.

Figures **4.24** and **4.25** show the normalized CO_2 and O_2 yield correlations for the compartment and hood wood crib fires. The agreement between data is quite good with similar yield coefficients for both experiments.

It is important to note, though, that Beyler's wood data is based on an assumed composition. Beyler burned ponderosa pine and determined the theoretical maximum yields (k_{CO_2} , k_{CO} and k_{H_2O}) from the low fuel-to-air ratio yield data. He then estimated the empirical chemical formula by choosing a composition that reasonably represented all three yields [15]. In contrast, the spruce burned in the compartment fires was analyzed to determine the elemental composition. Although a direct comparison between normalized yield-equivalence ratio correlations may be questioned, the agreement in concentration data (which is unaffected by the choice of chemical formula), shown in Figures **4.26** to **4.28**, suggest that the comparison of normalized yield data is reasonable. However, Beyler's correlations may be shifted with respect to the equivalence ratio.




Figure 4.23 Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations obtained for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.24 Comparison of normalized CO₂ yield correlations obtained for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.25 Comparison of normalized O₂ yield correlations obtained for wood fires in the compartment and in Beyler's hood.




Figure 4.26 Comparison of upper layer CO concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for wood compartment and hood fires.




Figure 4.27 Comparison of upper layer CO₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for wood compartment and hood fires.




Figure 4.28 Comparison of upper layer O₂ concentration versus plume equivalence ratio for wood compartment and hood fires.

4.2.4 Temperature Dependence

The species yield correlations obtained in these compartment fires **are** qualitatively similar to those from Beyleis hood experiments, however significant differences exist. The differences between hood and compartment fire correlations are basically the same for both hexane and PMMA fires. For the range of equivalence ratios from about 0.5 to 1.3, higher CO production is measured in the hood experiments than in the compartment. Consistent with the production of CO, the normalized CO₂ and O₂ yields are lower for the hood fires. Thus, the compartment fires exhibit better utilization **of** oxygen and more complete combustion **as** indicated by the higher CO₂ yields. For equivalence ratios above 1.3, compartment fire CO yields increased to higher values than the hood yields.

The **main** difference in the fire environments between the two **types** of experiments is the upper layer temperature difference. For the primary region **of** discrepancy between equivalence ratios of 0.5 and **1.5**, Beyler observed average temperatures **from** about 240 to 620 K below those observed for the compartment fires which were higher than 900 K (**see** Table 4.1).

Work by Morehart showed that the upper layer composition **was** effected by temperature [16]. A simple chemical kinetic investigation of the upper layer at one equivalence ratio indicated that temperatures over 800 K **may** lead to further reaction in the compartment upper layer with **an** increase in CO. Although **this** trend is contrary to the discrepancies for overventilated fires, it suggests a temperature dependence exists. Morehart also studied the effect of increasing temperature on layer composition by adding different levels of insulation to his hood. He concluded for the range of temperatures studied (500 to **675**) that substantial increases in products of complete

combustion and decreases in fuel and oxygen occurred with increasing layer temperature. This work suggests that the increased temperatures in the compartment fires resulted in more complete combustion, as is indicated by the data.

The conversion of CO to CO₂ occurs via a reaction with a large temperature dependence. Therefore, it is expected that cooler layers freeze out the conversion of CO to CO₂, thus, resulting in higher CO concentrations. A kinetic study of the upper layer was performed to investigate the above theory and determine the effect of temperature on upper reactivity.

4.3 Chemical Kinetics Study of Upper Layer Gases

The goal of the study was to assess the reactivity of the upper layer gases in Beyler's experiments for a range of isothermal conditions characteristic of both the hood and compartment environments. It was expected that at temperatures characteristic of the compartment fire upper layers, the upper layer composition of Beyler's hood experiments would react and result in a composition similar to that in the compartment.

Due to the complexity and uncharacterized mixing and temperature gradients in a compartment fire plume, current kinetic schemes are unable to model the complete behavior of the reacting flows and, therefore, are unable to predict final layer compositions. However, modeling of upper layer gas phase chemistry is within the scope of current technology. Therefore, the study was conducted under the assumption that the generation of upper layer gases from a plume is independent of upper layer properties and surrounding compartment effects, such as radiation. That is to say at a given equivalence ratio, the plume generates the same products whether in the hood apparatus or in the compartment. The underlying assumption is that the upper layer and fire plume

can be separated **as two** distinct control volumes. For **this** study, the plume represents a source of generation of the **initial** upper layer composition.

Currently, kinetics modeling is a very active area **of** combustion research. Homogeneous **gas** phase reactions are reasonably well understood. However, heterogeneous chemistry, such **as** soot formation, is ill defined **and**, therefore, could not be incorporated into a kinetic model for **this** study.

4.3.1 Procedure

Kee, et al. at Sandia National Laboratories have developed a framework of computer codes and libraries known as CHEMKIN [34]. CHEMKIN provides the user with a framework to solve a set of differential equations describing gas phase elementary reactions. The libraries perform various chemical and thermodynamic operations and provide thermodynamic **data**. The **user** is **required to** formulate a kinetics model and driver code to run the CHEMKIN package.

Sandia provided a code **SENKIN** [35] which was **modified** to run on a VAX 11/780. This code was used to model the upper layer **as** a plug flow reactor. The code also performed sensitivity analysis **to** identify the key reactions for selected species.

The upper layer could have been modeled **as** either a perfectly-stirred reactor (**PSR**) or **as** a plug flow process. The **PSR** is characterized by fast mixing and approaches the plug flow process (slow mixing) **as** the upper layer residence time approaches **zero**. A similar study performed by Pitts has shown no significant differences in results for each method [36]. Due to familiarity with the code, the plug flow condition was used.

The kinetics model used was a subset of the Miller and Bowman mechanism [37], primarily a C₁-C₂ hydrocarbon oxidation model. All initial hydrocarbons were represented as ethylene (C₂H₄), consistent with Beyler's measurements which were used as initial inputs. Chakir, et al. made measurements of major species in a premixed, jet-stirred reactor for the oxidation of N-Heptane [38]. The results showed for a range of equivalence ratios from 0.5 to 2.0 and temperatures from 900 to 1170 K that ethylene was the major constituent of unburned hydrocarbons. Methane was the second highest constituent and typically accounted for only 6 to 12 percent of the total carbon in unburned hydrocarbons. A case in this study where 10 percent of the carbon in total hydrocarbons was represented as CH₄ showed no notable difference compared to assuming 100 percent C₂H₄. Therefore, the use of a C₁-C₂ mechanism is reasonable under the assumption that all hydrocarbons are represented as ethylene. Moreover, Dagaut, et al., reported that the inclusion of a C₃-C₄ submechanism was of minor importance in modeling the oxidation of ethylene with a C₁-C₄ mechanism [39].

The kinetic rates are represented using the modified Arrhenius equation:

$$k = A T^b \exp(-E/RT) \quad [4.1]$$

where A is the pre-exponential term, T is the gas temperature, E is the activation energy and R is the universal gas constant. Appendix B includes the reaction mechanism and rate constant data used.

The general procedure was to use Beyler's hexane upper layer composition measurements as the initial mixtures. This provided a range of cases from ϕ_p of 0.47 to 1.55. Each case was then run at the corresponding hood upper layer temperature and at a temperature representative of the compartment upper layer for fires with the Same

equivalence ratio. The model calculated species concentrations with respect to time for a period of 40 seconds, which was a typical residence time for the hood experiments.

4.3.2 Results

Figures 4.29 to 4.31 show the calculated CO, CO₂ and O₂ concentrations at both the hood and compartment layer temperatures for hexane fires plotted versus the equivalence ratio. For both sets of temperatures, the calculated concentrations are reported for a time of 40 seconds. The initial species concentration at each equivalence ratio is also plotted. The results show that the upper layer was unreactive at the hood temperatures as indicated by no change in the species concentrations from initial conditions. At the compartment temperatures, the composition is significantly changed. As can be seen in Figure 4.29 and 4.30 for overventilated fires, CO is almost entirely oxidized to CO₂. Figure 4.31 shows that the O₂ concentrations decrease with equivalence ratio to values below the initial conditions, consistent with the oxidation of CO and hydrocarbons.

The underventilated results show a dramatic increase in the CO levels at the elevated compartment fire temperatures. This is subsequently accompanied by a decrease in CO₂ with increasing equivalence ratio. However, in comparison to the initial composition, the higher underventilated CO₂ concentrations are relatively unchanged, indicating that the O₂ is utilized entirely for hydrocarbon oxidation and CO oxidation is frozen.

Figure 4.32 and 4.33 present the calculated major species concentrations plotted in time for an over- and underventilated case ($\phi_p = 0.91$ and 1.36) at compartment fire temperatures. As can be seen in Figure 4.32 for an overventilated fire, the CO




Figure 4.29 Chemical kinetics model calculated CO concentrations versus plume equivalence ratio for cases run at hood layer temperatures and cases run at compartment layer temperatures.




Figure 4.30 Chemical kinetics model calculated CO₂ concentrations versus plume equivalence ratio for cases run at hood layer temperatures and cases run at compartment layer temperatures.




Figure 4.31 Chemical kinetics model calculated O_2 concentrations versus plume equivalence ratio for cases run at hood layer temperatures and cases run at compartment layer temperatures.




Figure 4.32 Model calculated major species concentrations versus time for of $\phi_p = 0.91$ and $T = 900$ K.




Figure 4.33 Model calculated major species concentrations versus time for $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.

concentration initially rises as C_2H_4 is oxidized and the CO_2 remains fairly constant. When the C_2H_4 is consumed, CO begins to oxidize to CO_2 resulting in a net depletion of CO for times greater than 8 seconds.

For the underventilated fire shown in Figure 4.33, CO rises quickly as C_2H_4 is oxidized. Oxygen is depleted before all C_2H_4 is oxidized resulting in a CO concentration over three times the initial value. Carbon dioxide remains unchanged.

The effect of temperature is presented in Figures 4.34 and 4.35 which show the CO concentration as a function of time and upper layer temperature for both an over- and underventilated case ($\phi_p = 0.91$ and 1.36), respectively. As is clearly seen, the net CO concentration in the upper layer is strongly dependent on both the temperature and the residence time. Overventilated cases such as Figure 4.34, indicate that the net depletion of CO will not occur (within realistic residence times) unless the temperature is about 875 K or higher. The rise in CO concentrations in Figures 4.34 and 4.35 is due to the oxidation of C_2H_4 as was shown in Figures 4.32 and 4.33. The results presented in Figure 4.35 for an underventilated fire suggest that a temperature between 800 to 850 K is needed to promote the reactions governing hydrocarbon oxidation.

To determine the effective freeze out temperature for CO oxidation, the model was run at different temperatures for a case of ϕ_p equal to 0.71 in which the small initial concentration of C_2H_4 was omitted. The results showed that significant CO oxidation did not occur for temperatures below 800 K.




Figure 4.34 Model calculated CO concentration versus time at different isothermal conditions for $\phi_p = 0.91$.




Figure 4.35 Model calculated CO concentration versus time at different isothermal conditions for $\phi_p = 1.36$.

4.3.3 Discussion

For overventilated conditions, the model-predicted upper layer composition agrees well with the compartment fire measurements, however the model considerably overpredicts CO concentrations for underventilated fires. This can be seen in Figures 4.36 to 4.38 which show the comparison between model calculated CO, CO₂ and O₂ concentrations at the hexane compartment fire temperatures and the hexane compartment fire measurements of this study plotted against the equivalence ratio. At compartment temperatures, the modeling shows the initial hood CO and O₂ concentrations decreasing and CO₂ increasing consistent with the measurements for overventilated fires.

For underventilated conditions the model-predicted upper layer composition does not agree with the compartment ~~fire~~ measurements. The calculated CO concentrations are 2 to 4 times higher than the concentrations measured in the compartment. The highest CO concentration observed in a compartment fire was 3.7% at ϕ_p of 2.9; the modeling results show concentrations as high as 7.3% at a ϕ_p of only 1.6. Model predicted CO₂ concentrations are as much as 26 percent lower than measured values and the calculated O₂ concentrations of zero are slightly lower than the compartment measurements of about one percent. It is interesting to note that for overventilated conditions, the kinetic model calculated results can also be obtained by using thermodynamic equilibrium; however, this is not true for underventilated conditions.

The modeling indicates that the oxidation of C₂H₄ is faster than CO oxidation. As can be seen in Figure 4.32, significant CO oxidation does not occur until nearly all available C₂H₄ is consumed. The CO concentration rises due to the initial hydrocarbon




Figure 4.36 Comparison of calculated CO concentrations at compartment fire temperatures and compartment fire measurements plotted against plume equivalence ratio.




Figure 4.37 Comparison of calculated CO₂ concentrations at compartment fire temperatures and compartment fire measurements plotted against plume equivalence ratio.




Figure 4.38 Comparison of calculated O₂ concentrations at compartment fire temperatures and compartment fire measurements plotted against plume equivalence ratio.

oxidation. As the C_2H_4 concentration decreases the remaining available O_2 is then used for the conversion of CO to CO_2 .

As can be seen in Figure 4.20, ϕ_p of 1.3 marks a crossover point at which compartment CO measurements transition **from** lower to higher values than observed in the hood experiments. The modeling work shows the same transition, but at a slightly lower ϕ_p of 1.1 (Figure 4.29). Thus, the **results** indicate, for ϕ_p less than 1.1, that the elevated temperatures observed in the compartment fires ($T > 900$ K) allow nearly complete oxidation of CO to CO_2 **in** the upper layer for overventilated and slightly underventilated conditions and that at the hood temperatures the CO to CO_2 reaction is frozen resulting in elevated CO concentrations.

Although the discrepancy between the model results and the measurements exists, the kinetics **still** suggest that the elevated temperature difference is the **reason** for the lower CO measurements in the compartment fires than in the hood fires. As mentioned above, the crossover point at which compartment CO measurements transition from lower to higher values (than those observed in the hood experiments) occurs at an equivalence ratio of **1.3**, only slightly higher than the same transition shown in the modeling results at a ϕ_p of 1.1.

It is of interest to understand why the model overpredicts the CO concentrations measured in the compartment upper layer. In analyzing **this** problem, significant insight is gained on the underlying physics and chemistry controlling CO formation in compartment fires. According to the model during underventilated conditions, O_2 is depleted during hydrocarbon oxidation due to the high initial C_2H_4 levels. **This** results in high levels of CO and H_2 and remaining C_2H_4 . There is negligible CO_2 production

indicating that no CO oxidation occurs. **Pitts**, in a similar study using Morehart's methane data, observed similar results [36]. He states that the free radicals (H, OH and HO₂) needed for CO and H₂ oxidation remain at low levels since they are considerably more reactive with hydrocarbon fuels, such as ethylene. In the absence of hydrocarbons, the radical pool grows and CO is oxidized as in the overventilated cases.

4.3.3.1 Suitability of Chemical Kinetics

The discrepancy between underventilated model results and experimental measurements of CO can be the result of two primary problems: 1) the gas-phase kinetics are incorrect and 2) the modeling approach and assumptions are incorrect. The state of gas-phase kinetics is currently quite good although much work continues in refining kinetic rates and mechanisms. Models have successfully reproduced experimental results for a range of combustion conditions and fuels. For example, oxidation of simple fuels, such as CO/H₂/O₂ kinetics, in shock tubes and various reactor experiments has been modeled successfully by Yetter and Dryer [40,41]. The modeling of even more complex fuel oxidation such as CH₄ [42], C₂H₄ [43], C₂H₆ [44], nC₇H₁₆ [38] and C₂H₅OH [45] has shown good agreement with experimental results and, thus, confirms the general validity of current gas phase kinetic modeling.

Although the kinetic modeling is reasonably accurate, the kinetics of CO oxidation in the range of temperature from 800 to 1100 K proves to be complex and not fully understood [36]. **Pitts** investigated the use of various mechanisms on the formation of CO using Morehart's methane results for initial conditions [36]. From his results, shown here as Figure 4.39, and an analysis of the mechanisms, he concludes that variations in CO concentration are due primarily to differences in the rates of reactions involving HO₂.




Figure 4.39 Carbon monoxide mole fractions plotted as a function of time for an isothermal plug flow reactor using three reaction mechanisms taken from the literature: A) Dagaut et al.'s methane oxidation mechanism [42], B) Dagaut et al.'s ethylene oxidation mechanism [39], and C) Morehart's mechanism [16]. Solid lines represent reactor temperatures of 900 K and dotted lines reactor temperatures of 1200 K. (Figure taken from Pitts [36]). Dot-dash and dotdotdash lines represent results of this study using a subset of Miller and Bowman's mechanism at 900 and 1200 K, respectively.

The Miller and Bowman (MB) mechanism was used to model the same case studied by Pitts in Figure 4.39. The results of these tests have been sketched on to Figure 4.39. As can be seen at 1200 K, the MB mechanism predicts similar CO concentrations as the other mechanisms. However, at 900 K, the MB mechanism predicts a CO level approximately 70 percent higher than that using Dagaut, et al.'s methane oxidation mechanism [42]. This comparison suggests that the predicted CO concentrations using Miller and Bowman may be as much as 70 percent high. This, however, is not sufficient to account for the factor of 2 to 4 difference between experimental CO measurements and model predicted values.

Before Pitts' work was reviewed, a study was performed in this investigation to determine the effect on CO production from updating the Miller and Bowman mechanism. The most current, applicable mechanism, considering only C₁-C₂ species, is that proposed by Dagaut, et al. for ethane oxidation [44]. Key reactions (identified with a sensitivity analysis) of the Miller and Bowman mechanism were updated with the rate data used in Dagaut's mechanism.

A sensitivity analysis was performed for the case of ϕ_p equal to 1.36 and a temperature of 1000 K and the results of for CO, C₂H₄ and CO₂ are presented in Figures 4.40 to 4.42. As can be seen in Figures 4.40 and 4.41, the top twelve key reactions for CO and C₂H₄ are the same. The rate constant data for all twelve reactions was updated and the model run for each case ($\phi_p = 1.36$ and $\phi_p = 0.91$).

The results of the sensitivity analysis indicate that both C₂H₄ and CO are most sensitive to the following five reactions (listed in decreasing order):

CO

Mole Fraction Sensitivity




Figure 4.40 Normalized sensitivity coefficients for key reactions in Miller and Bowman mechanism of CO for a case of $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.

C₂H₄

Mole Fraction Sensitivity




Figure 4.41 Normalized sensitivity coefficients for key reactions in Miller and Bowman mechanism of C₂H₄ for a case of $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.

CO2

Mole Fraction Sensitivity




Figure 4.42 Normalized sensitivity coefficients for key reactions in Miller and Bowman mechanism of CO_2 for a case of $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K.



The values in parenthesis are normalized sensitivity coefficients, which represent the percent change in CO with respect to a one percent change in the given reaction rate. For example, doubling the rate of reaction (a) would increase the production of CO by a factor of 3. The sensitivity coefficients for C_2H_4 are the same in magnitude but reverse in sign of those for CO.

Figure 4.42 shows that the key reactions for CO_2 formation are reactions (a) to (e) listed above. However, the low sensitivity coefficients of 0.1 and less indicate that the CO_2 concentration is minorly effected by the mechanism. The main reaction for the oxidation of carbon monoxide ($\text{CO} + \text{OH} \rightleftharpoons \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}$) does not even appear as one of the top twelve key reactions in the CO sensitivity analysis for underventilated conditions. This and the direct coupling between C_2H_4 and CO oxidation indicate that CO levels cannot be reduced without resulting in higher hydrocarbon concentrations. Experimental results agree with such an outcome, as do the results of using the updated mechanisms studied here and by Pitts [36].

The results for the case of ϕ_p equal to 1.36 using the updated mechanism are shown in Figure 4.43. Differences between mechanisms can be made by comparing the results




Figure 4.43 Calculated major species concentrations for $\phi_p = 1.36$ and $T = 1000$ K using Miller and Bowman mechanism with 12 key reactions (identified in CO sensitivity analysis) updated with rate constant data from Dagaut, et al.'s ethane oxidation mechanism [44].

presented in Figure 4.43 and 4.33. The updated Miller and Bowman mechanism results in a doubling of the time needed for reaction and a net decrease of 12 percent in CO formation. The decrease in the net CO production is due primarily to reduced C_2H_4 oxidation and not to CO oxidation. These results are consistent with those of Pitts, presented in Figure 4.39, and confirm that although the gas phase kinetic mechanisms of CO oxidation continue to be refined, they do not appear to be the cause of the large discrepancy between predicted and experimental CO concentrations.

4.3.3.2 Analysis of Modeling Approach

Accepting the suitability of the kinetic mechanisms indicates that there must be a problem with the assumptions of the modeling approach. Two assumptions that were necessary to perform the study are identified as possible sources of error. One is the assumption that the generation of upper layer gases from a plume is independent of upper layer properties and surrounding compartment effects, such as radiation. That is to say at a given equivalence ratio, the plume generates the same products whether in the hood apparatus or in the compartment. The second suspect assumption is that the exclusion of soot formation in the model has no effect on CO formation.

The formation of soot occurs primarily in the fuel side of a flame under low O_2 and high temperature conditions. Temperatures of 1300 K and higher are needed to promote soot formation. The carbonaceous particles that are initially formed either oxidize in the flame or react further to form smoke [46]. Due to the existence of O_2 and the relatively low temperatures ($T < 1200$ K) in the modeled upper layer compositions, the formation of soot is unlikely. However, the interaction of existing soot in the initial composition with the gas phase species is uncertain. Hydrocarbons are expected to be adsorbed by the

soot particles, but due to the excess of hydrocarbons, it is doubtful that significant quantities would be consumed in ~~this~~ way to affect the net CO concentration. A second possibility is that soot may compete favorably for OH, thus, decreasing hydrocarbon oxidation. However, unless ~~soot~~ oxidizes completely, net CO levels would not be expected ~~to~~ decrease. The affect of soot on the hydrocarbon and CO chemistry cannot be fully determined, ~~so~~ excluding soot chemistry from the modeling remains ~~as~~ a possible source of error.

The fire plume is a complex diffusion ~~flame~~ created ~~from~~ the buoyancy dominated flow ~~of~~ vaporizing fuel particles and the subsequent entrained air flow. Due to the variable, localized temperature and species ~~gradients~~, and turbulent mixing, the plume is difficult ~~to~~ characterize. However, study of the plume, in a global sense, provides useful insights into understanding the generation of upper layer species.

Beyler's propane results suggest that the production of upper layer gases is independent of the structure and fluid dynamics of the flame. Beyler modified a 19 cm burner by including a 2.8 cm lip ~~to~~ enhance turbulence and the large-scale structure of the flame [14]. *Compared* to the no lip burner, he reported that the flame was markedly changed and that air entrainment ~~was~~ increased by **30%**. Yet, the species correlations were the same for both burners.

The insensitivity of species yields to the details ~~of~~ the flame structure is also suggested by the compartment fire hexane results. The correlations obtained included data ~~from~~ fires with a range of air entrainment rates ~~from~~ 50 to 128 g/s utilizing various size burn pans. In several cases, nearly equal steady-state equivalence ratio fires were obtained with different size pans and, consequently, quite varied burning rates and air entrainment rates (up to **50%** different). The varied conditions and, yet, the good

correlation between yields and equivalence ratio suggest that the yields are not sensitive to the details of the **flame** structure.

Based on the observed temperature effect on the upper layer reactivity, it is reasonable to assume that the temperature difference between experiments results in different temperature plumes and, thus, varying species generation rates from the plume itself. Support for this can be found in the work of Morehart [16], which is described in detail in section 1.3.1. Morehart studied the effect of increasing temperature on layer composition by adding different levels of insulation to his hood. He concluded for the range of temperatures studied (**500 to 675**) that substantial increases in products of complete combustion and decreases in fuel and oxygen occurred with increasing layer temperature. Upper layer oxygen mass fraction was reduced by approximately **70** percent over the **175 K** temperature increase. The temperatures of Morehart's upper layer were well below **800 K**. Considering that the layer was unreactive at these temperatures, the change in layer composition must have been due to changes in the plume chemistry.

As illustrated by Morehart [16], the more complete combustion can be attributed to an extension of the flammability **limits** (or reaction zone) in the plume due to raising the flame temperature. The temperature of the plume can increase by two mechanisms when comparing varying experimental apparatus. One, the plume radiates less heat away when in a more enclosed or insulated space, and **two**, a hotter layer **means** entrainment of hotter gases into the upper part **of** the plume which is immersed in the layer.

The above discussion clearly demonstrates that changing the plume temperature can substantially increase the O_2 and fuel consumption and, primarily, increase the levels of products of complete combustion, with a small increase in CO. The conclusions of the above discussion **are** directly applicable in explaining the differences between the

modeling results and the hexane compartment ~~fire~~ measurements. To have correctly modeled the effect of temperature on layer reactivity, Beyler's layer composition should have been modified to account for the temperature effect on the plume generation of initial layer ~~gases~~. ~~Based~~ on the ~~this~~ effect, the initial composition used in the modeling should have contained higher CO₂ and H₂O concentrations and lower O₂ and C₂H₄ concentrations. The net effect on the modeling results would be increased CO₂ levels and reduced CO levels ~~from~~ less incomplete hydrocarbon oxidation due to the lower availability of O₂ and C₂H₄ in the initial layer composition. These changes would be consistent with the experimental measurements and significantly reduce the disparity between model and experimental results for underventilated conditions.

4.3.4 Conclusion

~~To~~ summarize, the effect of temperatures on compartment fire upper layer composition appears to be ~~two~~ fold; 1) the generation of species in the plume is changed and **2)** oxidation of post flame gases in the layer is effected. Elevated compartment temperatures correlate ~~with~~ increased plume temperatures and more, primarily complete, oxidation of the fuel to CO₂ and H₂O. The layer temperature dictates post flame oxidation in the layer. Temperatures above 875 K allow nearly complete oxidation of CO to CO₂ for overventilated and slightly underventilated conditions. Layer temperatures below 875 K will result in ~~freezing~~ out the CO to CO₂ reaction, leaving high CO concentrations. ~~During~~ underventilated conditions, ~~two~~ mechanisms effecting net CO formation compete (CO and hydrocarbon oxidation). Increasing temperature over **875 K** depletes CO by accelerating the CO to CO₂ conversion. However, with increasing equivalence ratios, incomplete oxidation of unburned hydrocarbons ~~increases~~ the CO

level. Since hydrocarbon oxidation is much faster than CO oxidation, net CO levels increase with equivalence ratio as unburned hydrocarbon concentrations increase.

4.4 Comparison of Correlations Between Fuels

In terms of fire safety engineering, ideal compartment fire behavior would be characterized with robust yield-equivalence ratio correlations that are independent of fuel type, temperature, compartment size and other fire parameters. This section discusses the effect of fuel composition on the correlations obtained for the compartment fires using hexane, PMMA, spruce and polyurethane as fuels.

4.4.1 Carbon Monoxide

The unnormalized and normalized CO yield correlations are presented for all fuels in Figures 4.44 and 4.45. The primary difference between correlations is that significant CO levels existed for overventilated spruce and polyurethane fires but not for the hexane or PMMA fires. The difference is believed to be a result of the upper layer temperature effect discussed in the previous sections. For the region of interest between ϕ_p of 0.6 and 1, the spruce and polyurethane fires typically had temperatures of 850 K and lower compared to temperatures of 920 K and higher for hexane and PMMA. The modeling work indicated that upper layer temperatures of 875 K were needed to oxidize all CO to CO₂. Based on the average layer temperatures, the higher spruce and polyurethane CO yield data agrees very well with this theory. The temperatures above 900 K for PMMA and most hexane resulted in near complete CO oxidation as indicated by the low yields.

Considering that the effect of the layer temperature could be removed and the CO yields appropriately readjusted, the generation of CO, which is a product of incomplete combustion, does not appear to be strongly governed by fuel composition. As a matter of




Figure 4.44 Comparison of unnormalized CO yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.




Figure 4.45 Comparison of normalized CO yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.

fact, closer agreement is observed between fuels for **unnormalized** yields than normalized yields. This is believed to be due to the fact that CO is effectively an "intermediate" product which depends more on the elementary chemistry than on fuel composition which determines products of complete combustion.

Figure 4.45 shows the normalized CO yield correlations for all fuels tested. The general trends between fuels are the same **as** for the **unnormalized** CO correlations except that the normalized **data** for **all** fuels does not agree **as well as** the **unnormalized data**. The normalized hexane yields level out to an average of 0.11 and the PMMA and polyurethane yields appear to level out to 0.19, 73 percent higher than hexane. Thus, the **unnormalized** yields show closer agreement between fuels **as** they differ by less than 20 percent. A study of Beyleis data reveals the same general conclusion. This trend is advantageous in terms of fire analysis, because the use of the **unnormalized** yield correlation is preferred since no knowledge of the fuel composition is needed.

Only the hexane **data** shows a distinct leveling **off** of the CO yield for highly underventilated conditions. The average **unnormalized** CO yield for underventilated hexane **fires** was **0.22**. Polyurethane and PMMA **unnormalized** CO yield **data** suggest a leveling off is **starting** to **occur** at a value of about **0.26**, less **than 20** percent higher than the hexane result. However, any global conclusion about CO yields leveling **off** during underventilated conditions is restricted by the **limited** equivalence ratios obtained for the fuels. **Based** on the kinetic modeling and the leveling off of hexane yields above ϕ_p equal **to** 1.5, CO is expected to level out for non-oxygenated fuels when layer O_2 concentrations **go** to **zero** with increasing equivalence ratio. The **burning** of oxygenated fuels, such **as** PMMA, may continue **to increase** CO levels with increasing equivalence ratio since the additional fuel carries its own oxygen to at least partially oxidize to CO.

Although relatively insensitive to fuel, the CO yield does depend on fuel composition. Beyler observed that different fuels had basically the same normalized CO yield correlations up to an equivalence ratio of 0.9, and that above 0.9, the yields leveled out to different average values for the different fuels: 0.09 for hexane, 0.13 for PMMA and 0.15 for pine. Beyler's average yields were taken for fires with equivalence ratios greater than 1.2. Beyler observed that CO yields **are** higher for fuels with higher oxygen-to-carbon ratios. The hexane and PMMA studied in the compartment fires show the same ranking. This trend is consistent with the chemical kinetics results, presented in section 4.3, that hydrocarbon oxidation is faster than CO oxidation. Thus, the oxygenated fuels, which can be considered already partially oxidized, produce more CO faster than the CO can oxidize to **CO₂**.

As can be seen in Figure 4.44, the hexane data can be viewed **as** a lower limit of CO yield observed for **all** fuels tested. Except for toluene, **this** is **also** true for all fuels that Beyler studied. **An** approximate fit of the hexane data is proposed as a lower boundary of the **unnormalized** CO yield in a compartment fire:

$$Y_{CO} = (0.22/180) * \tan^{-1}[10*(\phi-1.25)] + 0.11 \quad [4.2a]$$

where the result of the inverse tangent function is in degrees. This equation is representative of fires with upper layer temperatures greater than 875 K. The effect of temperature on the hexane CO yields is shown in Figure 4.44 **as** equation [4.2b], which is a fit to Beyler's hood data for hexane fires.

$$Y_{CO} = (0.19/180) * \tan^{-1}[10*(\phi_p-0.8)] + 0.095 \quad [4.2b]$$

Consistent with the temperature theory, equation (2) brackets the **rise** of CO yield at low ϕ_p for spruce and polyurethane burned in the compartment **as** both had upper layer

temperatures below 875 K. However, higher CO yields are observed for polyurethane than for hexane at low temperatures (i.e., as represented by equation (2)). This is attributed to polyurethane being an oxygenated fuel.

4.4.2 Carbon Dioxide and Oxygen

The CO₂ and O₂ **unnormalized** yields correlate well with respect to equivalence ratio for each fuel. However, the correlations are quantitatively different and cannot be described by a single curve. For example, the overventilated CO₂ yield for hexane is 3.1 and **only** 1.1 for spruce. ~~For~~ different fuels, the CO₂ and O₂ yield to equivalence ratio correlations only collapse down to a single curve when the yields are normalized by the maximum possible yield for the given fuel. Although complete combustion does not always occur, combustion efficiencies are similar enough between fuels that a fuel's particular stoichiometry will dictate the generation of CO₂ and the depletion of O₂. Therefore, the species associated with near complete combustion are not expected to have **equal** yields for different fuels since varying fuel compositions will dictate different **limits** of CO₂ that can be generated and O₂ that can be consumed **per** a gram of fuel burned. By normalizing the yields, the variability of fuel composition is removed.

Figures 4.46 and 4.47 show the normalized CO₂ and O₂ yield correlations for **all** fuels tested. As can be seen, there is very **good** agreement between **all** fuels and the data is well described by the simple model. The CO₂ **data** deviates from the model **as** is expected to account for the unburned hydrocarbons and production of CO and smoke.

4.4.3 Smoke

• The yield of smoke appeared to be governed by the chemical nature of the fuel. Soot is formed in a **flame** where concentration gradients produce low oxygen levels. In




Figure 4.46 Comparison of normalized CO₂ yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.




Figure 4.47 Comparison of normalized O₂ yield correlations for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.

these regions, pyrolysis of the fuel leads to the formation of species, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and polyacetylenes, which are considered precursors to soot [46]. Depending on localized temperatures and oxygen concentrations, soot may either burn in the flame or grow, leading to the emission of smoke from the flame. Fuels with higher oxygen-to-carbon, O/C, ratios tend to produce less smoke, and the data bears this out. Hexane produced the highest average overventilated smoke yield (0.016) compared to the oxygenated fuels. Additionally, polyurethane, which has an O/C ratio of 0.3, produced over twice as much smoke as spruce, which has an O/C ratio of 1.5. Polyurethane fires had an average yield of 0.013 and spruce fires had an average of 0.046 for ϕ_p between 0.5 and 1.

Fuels with higher O/C ratios effectively have more oxygen readily available to, one, oxidize the fuel to CO and, two, reduce the probability of regions of low oxygen concentrations in the flame. Thus, fuel pyrolysis, which is needed for soot initiation, is reduced. Due to the effect of higher O/C ratios, it is then consistent to state that fuels with higher tendencies to soot produce less CO for underventilated conditions. As earlier discussed, increasing the fuel O/C ratio increases the CO yield at high equivalence ratios. This is because the oxidation of hydrocarbons occurs faster than the oxidation of CO. Thus, extra oxygen available in more oxygenated fuels results in hydrocarbons oxidizing to CO faster than CO can oxidize to CO₂.

4.4.4 Combustion Efficiency

Figure 4.48 shows the combustion efficiency plotted against the equivalence ratio for all fuels. The maximum possible heat release rate, $X_{c_{max}}$, is also plotted for comparison. The over- and underventilated average ratio of $X_c/X_{c_{max}}$ is presented along




Figure 4.48 Comparison of combustion efficiency for all fuels tested in the compartment fires.

with the average combustion efficiencies in Table 4.3 for **all** the fuels tested, including Beyler's **data**. The correlations for each fuel agree reasonably well. The combustion efficiency is relatively constant for overventilated fires and decreases with increasing equivalence ratio for highly underventilated **fires**. Tewarson **reported** similar results for **wood** crib enclosure fires except that quite low combustion efficiencies of about **0.7** for overventilated fires were observed and the combustion efficiency did not decrease until an equivalence ratio of about 1.4 [17]. As discussed in chapter 1, it is important **to** note that the equivalence ratio **data** presented by Tewarson, was not measured directly but calculated **from** the ventilation parameter, $Ah^{1/2}$, and, therefore is suspect. Moreover, the elemental compositions used for the wood studies reported by Tewarson were not corrected for char yield. A correction of **this** sort would tend to decrease the equivalence ratio and increase the calculated combustion efficiency, more consistent with the compartment fires studied in **this** work.

As can be seen in Figure 4.48, the combustion efficiency for compartment fires can be predicted **as** a simple function of the equivalence ratio and represented **by** the following equation:

Equation (4)

$$X_c = A \quad \phi < 1 \quad [4.3a]$$

$$X_c = A / \phi \quad \phi > 1 \quad [4.3b]$$

where A is an experimentally determined value for the ratio of $X_c/X_{c_{max}}$, the combustion efficiency to the **maximum** possible combustion efficiency, for **a** given **fuel and** burning mode (over- or underventilated). Based on the **four** fuels tested, an average value of 0.81

Table 4.3 Average combustion efficiency and average ratio of combustion efficiency to maximum possible efficiency for all the fuels tested in compartment fires and for the similar fuels tested by Beyler.

FUEL	$X_{C_{AVG}}$		$X_C/X_{C_{max}}$	
	$\phi < 1$	$\phi > 1$	$\phi < 1$	$\phi > 1$
Hexane	0.91	0.42	0.91	0.65
PMMA	0.99	0.61	0.99	0.84
Spruce	1.01	0.93	1.01	0.98
Polyurethane	0.86	0.55	0.86	0.77
BEYLER:				
Hexane	0.77	0.40	0.77	0.50
PMMA	0.82	0.57	0.82	0.71
Ponderosa Pine	0.92	0.65	0.92	0.87

is suggested for a first estimate for underventilated compartment fires. The ~~ratio~~ of $X_c/X_{c_{\max}}$ is not ~~a~~ constant with increasing equivalence ~~ratio~~. Therefore, the above estimate for A is just ~~that~~; for example, values ~~as~~ low ~~as~~ 0.65 are observed for very underventilated hexane fires. Based on work by Toner and by Morehart, a value of 0.9 is suggested for gaseous fuels which, by nature, will burn more completely than solid and liquid fuels. From Beyler's ~~data~~ an average value of 0.96 ~~is~~ obtained for propane and an average value of 0.90 is obtained for propene.

CHAPTER 5

CARBON MONOXIDE PRODUCTION DOWNSTREAM OF THE COMPARTMENT

5.1 Introduction

Due to the flow of fire gases through a building, many people die in rooms that are remote from the source of the fire. Therefore, it is important to be able to predict the composition of gases leaving a compartment fire. The correlations presented in Chapter 3 provide a means to predict the major species yields in an upper layer. However, it was not previously known what the yields of these species are outside of the compartment, especially with the presence of external combustion. This chapter presents and discusses the results of the study of carbon monoxide production downstream of a compartment fire. The different modes of external burning observed are characterized and the effect of external burning on CO and smoke yields downstream of hexane-fueled compartment fires is examined.

5.2 Experiments

Downstream-sampled experiments were conducted to study the effect of external burning on the levels of CO leaving the compartment. The experimental procedure and apparatus were described in Chapter 2 and are essentially the same as used for the upper layer-sampled tests. Basically, the downstream-sampled tests consisted of burning hexane-fueled fires under the same conditions as the hexane-fueled upper layer-sampled tests. Sampling downstream of the compartment in the exhaust duct provided measurements of the effect of external burning on the yields of CO and CO₂ exiting the compartment compared to the initial yields in the upper layer. Smoke measurements

during the periods of external burning were compared to smoke levels just prior to the phenomenon.

5.3 Results and Discussion

Two distinctly different types of external combustion phenomena were observed during the compartment fires: 1) external flames jets and 2) flames due to external ignition and burning of fuel-rich exhaust gases (referred to as external burning). External flame jets were a result of large ceiling and wall jets that wrapped around the soffit and out the vent and, in the case of large vent sizes, **from** the extension of the main compartment fire out the ventilation opening. In general, external flame jets preceded external burning and were red/orange in color extending up to **0.75** m outside of the exhaust vent. External burning was characterized by large turbulent diffusion flames that were orange/yellow in color and extended up **to** 1.5 m outside **of** the vent. For underventilated (plume equivalence **ratio** greater than one) compartment fires **with** external combustion, the usual sequence of events, **as** the plume equivalence ratio became richer, was **as** follows: A) the appearance of external flame jets, B) quick flashes **of** external burning, C) significant bursts **of** external burning lasting a second or longer, D) sustained external burning that usually encompassed the entire exhaust vent, E) external burning ended and F) external flame jets retreated into the compartment. It should be noted that every event did not occur for all underventilated fires.

Table 5.1 presents a list of the underventilated fires that were studied and shows, for each fire, the average quasi-steady-state equivalence ratio along with the instantaneous equivalence ratio at the time that the first initial flashes and sustained external burning were visually observed to have started. Overventilated fires are not included since, as was expected, none were observed to have external burning.

Table 5.1 Underventilated hexane compartment fires. ϕ_{ss} is the average steady-state equivalence ratio. ϕ_{flash} and ϕ_{sus} are the instantaneously measured equivalence ratio at the time of initial flashes and at the beginning of sustained external burning, respectively. $\phi_{50\%}$ is the instantaneous equivalence ratio at which a 50% reduction in downstream yield occurs due to external burning. UL designates upper layer-sampled test and * designates that no reduction in CO yield was observed.

Entry #	ϕ_{ss}	ϕ_{flash}	ϕ_{sus}	$\phi_{50\%}$	Vent (cm ²)
1	1.0			UL	400
2	1.0			*	400
3	1.1	1.1		UL	1600
4	1.1			UL	400
5	1.2	1.0		*	400
6	1.2	1.0		UL	400
7	1.2			UL	400
8	1.3			UL	400
9	1.3	0.9		UL	1600
10	1.3			UL	400
11	1.3			*	400
12	1.3	0.8		UL	1200
13	1.4	1.1		UL	1600
14	1.4	1.1		*	1200
15	1.4	1.2		*	1200
16	1.5	1.2		UL	1200
17	1.5	1.0		UL	800
18	1.5			*	400
19	1.7	1.4		UL	400
20	1.7	1.0	1.6	UL	1600
21	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.9	800
22	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.2	400
23	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.7	400
24	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	400
25	1.9	0.8	1.8	UL	800
26	1.9	0.9	1.7	1.8	800
27	1.9	0.8	1.8	1.8	1200
28	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.8	400
29	2.0	1.8	2.1	UL	800

Table 5.1 (CON'T)

Entry #	Φ_{ss}	Φ_{flash}	Φ_{sum}	$\Phi_{50\%}$	Vent (cm ²)
30	2.0	1.6	2.0	UL	800
31	2.0	1.7	2.0	2.0	400
32	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.3	400
33	2.2	1.7	2.0	UL	400
34	2.3	1.4	2.2	2.1	400
35	2.3	1.5	2.1	1.9	400
36	2.4	2.3	2.3	UL	400
37	2.4	0.9	1.8	1.7	800
38	2.5	0.9	1.6	1.6	800
39	2.5	1.3	1.7	UL	800
40	2.5	2.4	2.4	UL	400
41	2.6	1.5	1.8	UL	800
42	2.6	1.6	1.7	UL	800
43	2.8	1.2	2.2	UL	800
44	2.8	1.3	2.8	UL	400
45	2.9	1.2	1.5	UL	800
46	3.0	1.0	1.9	UL	800
	AVG:	1.4	1.9	1.9	
	STD:	±0.4	±0.3	±0.2	

Instantaneous equivalence ratios were determined by noting, ~~from~~ video tape, the time that the given mode of burning occurred and then identifying the instantaneously measured equivalence ratio ~~from~~ the ~~data~~ files. Column 5 of Table 5.1, discussed ~~below~~, shows the instantaneous equivalence ratio at which a 50 percent reduction in downstream CO yield was reached due to external burning. Column 6 is the exhaust vent size.

As can be seen ~~from~~ Table 5.1, a different equivalence ratio characterizes the ~~onset~~ of each mode of external burning. The progression of one mode of external burning to another, i.e. from flashes to sustained burning, is in general a function of increasing equivalence ratio; initial flashes occurred at an average ϕ of ~~1.4~~~~fl.4~~ and sustained external burning occurred at an average ϕ of 1.9 ± 0.3 . The fairly large standard deviations, particularly for initial flashes, ~~are~~ primarily due to the fact that initial flashes typically occurred during a very transient stage of the fire. Thus, the equivalence ratio was changing very rapidly over a ~~small~~ range of sampling time intervals leading to higher uncertainty in correlating it with the time of external burning.

The ~~data~~ also suggests that a relationship exists between the exhaust vent geometry and the instantaneous equivalence ratio at which external burning ~~occurs~~. The onset of sustained external burning ~~occurred~~ at higher instantaneous equivalence ratios, ϕ_{sur} , for the fires with the smaller ventilation ~~areas~~ (400 cm²). The average ϕ_{sur} is 2.1 ± 0.3 for fires with 400 ~~cm2~~ vents and ~~1.8~~~~fl.2~~ for fires with 800 to 1600 cm² vents. It was observed that the larger ventilation openings (800, 1200 and 1600 cm²) had substantially larger external flame jets which provided more of an ignition source for external burning to occur. Fires with the same equivalence ratio but with the smaller ventilation opening (400 cm²) were observed to have substantially smaller external ~~flame~~ jets or none at all.

An example of **this** can be seen in Table **5.1** between entries **19** and **20** which were for fires that had **similar** steady-state equivalence ratios and CO yields but different ventilation sizes. The fire with the **400** cm² vent was a smaller fire with only small (less than 15 cm extension out ~~of~~ the vent) intermittent external flame jets and only one flash of external burning that lasted for a few seconds. Whereas, the fire with the **1600** cm² vent had steady external flame jets about 60 cm out of the vent and had sustained external burning. Therefore, even though the potential for external burning is governed by the equivalence ratio, the exhaust vent geometry appears to be a factor since the presence of an ignition source (i.e. external flame jets) is **more** probable with a larger ventilation opening.

The downstream-sampled burning experiments clearly showed a substantial reduction in CO and smoke yields when sustained external burning occurred. Figures **5.1** and **5.2** shows the CO yield and equivalence ratio time histories of a typical upper layer-sampled hexane fire and a downstream-sampled fire with the same initial conditions (i.e., same fuel source, vent size and initial compartment temperature). As both fires became underventilated, the CO yield rose quickly approaching a value of 0.22. For the upper layer-sampled test, Figure 5.1 (entry **29** in Table **5.1**), initial flashes ~~of~~ external burning occurred at **219** seconds ($\phi = 1.7$). Sustained external burning started at 228 seconds ($\phi = 2.0$) and external burning fully encompassed the vent at **241** seconds ($\phi = 2.1$). Sustained external burning lasted until the end ~~of~~ the fire (330 seconds) when the fuel rapidly burned out. **During** the transition to and during sustained external burning the CO yield obtained a value of **0.2** in the upper layer.

For the downstream-sampled ~~fire~~, Figure **5.2** (entry **31** in Table **5.1**), the initial flashes ~~of~~ external burning appeared at **175** seconds ($\phi = 1.5$) which also ~~marked~~ the time




Figure 5.1 Typical time histories of upper layer CO yield and plume equivalence ratio for an underventilated hexane fire with external burning.




Figure 5.2 Typical time histories of downstream CO yield and plume equivalence ratio for an underventilated hexane fire with external burning. This fire had essentially the same initial conditions as the fire in Figure 5.1.

at which the CO yield had attained a value of **0.2**. At **194** seconds ($\phi = 2.1$) sustained external burning started. The external flame encompassed the vent at **202** seconds ($\phi = 2.2$) and lasted ~~until~~ **298** seconds when the fire burned out. ~~During~~ the transition from initial flashes to attached sustained burning, the CO yield decreased rapidly reaching a steady average of **0.02** which was a reduction to **10** percent of the CO level leaving the compartment upper layer. Also, during the period of sustained external burning, the CO₂ yield approached the theoretical maximum, thus, indicating near complete combustion of ~~all~~ carbon leaving the compartment.

The quasi-steady-state average ~~unnormalized~~ CO yield versus average equivalence ratio for each fire is plotted in Figure 5.3. For equivalence ratios less than **1.7**, the CO yield in the upper layer agrees well with the CO yield observed downstream of the compartment for ~~similar~~ fires. However, for fires reaching quasi-steady-state equivalence ratios of **1.7** or greater, the downstream measured CO yield ~~was~~ typically **10** to **25** percent of the CO yield in the upper layer for similar fires. All of the fires with reduced downstream CO yields had sustained external burning. Whereas, ~~all~~ fires which had downstream CO yields comparable to upper layer yields had no sustained burning, but, in some cases, did have flashes and/or bursts of external flames. It can also be seen ~~from~~ Figure 5.3 that the transition region exists about ~~an~~ equivalence ratio of **1.7** as illustrated by the fire with a yield of **0.12**. For ~~this~~ fire, sustained burning did not last the entire steady-state period ~~as~~ reflected in the higher average CO yield.

These averaged steady-state results suggest that a compartment fire reaching an instantaneous equivalence ratio greater than **1.7** would have sustained external burning and a substantial reduction in CO yield. To investigate ~~this point~~, the instantaneous equivalence ratio at which a **50** percent reduction in the downstream CO yield occurred




Figure 5.3 The averaged steady-state CO yield plotted against the averaged steady-state plume equivalence ratio for upper layer-sampled fires and for downstream-sampled fires.

was evaluated for **all** the downstream-sampled tests and the results are presented in column **5** of Table **5.1**. The average equivalence ratio at which a 50 percent CO yield reduction is obtained is 1.9 ± 0.2 which agrees with the average equivalence ratio for which sustained burning occurs. **Also**, the time at which a 50 percent CO yield reduction is obtained corresponds to within 10 seconds of the onset of sustained external burning, therefore, showing that sustained external burning is the important mode in terms of hazard reduction of compartment effluent.

The effect of external burning on the smoke yield was also investigated and found to qualitatively follow the effect on CO yield discussed above. Figure **5.4** shows the smoke and CO yield plotted with respect to **time** for a fire with external burning. **As** the ~~fire~~ became underventilated, before any external burning, **both** the smoke and the CO started to rise. The first flashes of external burning appeared at 305 seconds ($\phi = 1.7$). **As** sustained external burning **started** at 336 seconds ($\phi = 1.7$), both the smoke and CO yields decreased dramatically. For this particular fire, the smoke yield was reduced ~~from~~ **0.15** by essentially **100** percent during sustained external burning. However, in general the reduction in smoke ranged ~~from~~ **50** to **100** percent for the ~~fires~~ investigated. A plot of the quasi-steady-state average smoke yield versus the average equivalence ratio for each ~~fire~~ shows the same general trend **as** seen for the CO yield in Figure **5.3**, except with a larger amount of scatter in the smoke **data**. The average smoke yields for fires with and without sustained external burning were 0.015 and **0.007**, respectively. Visual observation **also** confirmed that a substantial reduction of smoke occurred with sustained external burning.

In a hood apparatus, Beyler ~~was~~ able to successfully predict the occurrence of burning along the interface between the hot upper layer of combustion products and the




Figure 5.4 Typical time history of smoke yield, CO yield and plume equivalence ratio for an underventilated hexane fire with external burning.

lower layer of ambient air [47]. Based on classical empirical relations for lean premixed flammability **limits**, an ignition index was developed such that a value greater than one indicates that the upper layer has the potential to burn along the interface if an ignition source is present. For hexane fires with upper layer temperatures between 500 to 600 K, Beyler predicted that layer burning would occur at plume equivalence ratios of **1.7** or greater, and he was able to show that the prediction agreed well with experimental results [48].

Since the proposed ignition criterion is quite general for any fuel/oxidant **stream** pairs, it is of interest to evaluate its usefulness in predicting the occurrence of any or all modes of external burning resulting from a jet of **hot**, fuel-rich upper layer gases issuing from the compartment into relatively quiescent **air**. Therefore, the ignition index was evaluated for each upper layer-sampled **fire**.

In calculating the index, the composition of the upper layer needed to be specified beyond the CO, CO₂ and O₂ mole fractions that were measured. The mole fraction of H₂O was calculated **as** the CO₂ mole **fraction** times the molar ratio of H₂O to CO₂ at stoichiometric conditions. **This** was the same assumption **used** to correct the **gas** concentration measurements for water removal (section **2.2.4.1**). **Where** measurements were not available, the mole fraction of unburned hydrocarbons (represented **as** C₂H₄) was estimated **from** the relationship that the fraction of unburned carbon equals $1-1/\phi$. Work by Beyler [14] and by Tewarson [27] has shown **this** relationship **to** be representative for compartment fire environments. Nitrogen was calculated from a mole balance once H₂ was determined.

The ignition index ~~was~~ calculated using several different methods of estimating the H_2 mole fraction. Based on Beyleis hexane data [48], the ratio of H_2 to CO concentrations range from **0.26** to **0.67** for underventilated conditions up to an equivalence ratio of **1.6**. The hydrogen mole fraction was calculated **from** the CO measurement using both extremes of the H_2 -to- CO ratio observed. A third method estimated the H_2 mole fraction **from** a mole balance. This method predicted H_2 concentrations approximately 3 times those observed by Beyler. Since the results of Chapter 3 indicate more complete combustion in the compartment fires, H_2 concentrations are expected to be less than those observed by Beyler, therefore, this method was considered unreasonable. Using a H_2 -to- CO ratio of **0.5** to calculate the H_2 mole fraction ~~was~~ deemed most representative of the expected measurements and resulted in ignition index values that agreed within **10** percent of using a ratio of 0.26.

The ignition index ~~was~~ calculated using the steady-state average measurements for the upper layer-sampled hexane fires. Table **5.2** shows the calculated ignition index for the underventilated fires. The results indicate that for fires obtaining steady-state equivalence ratios approximately equal **to** or greater than **1.3**, the upper layer had the potential **to** burn if an ignition source ~~was~~ present. This is in agreement with the experimental results, presented in Table **5.1**, that showed initial flashes of external burning occurring for fuels with equivalence ratios of **1.3** and higher, generally the fires with vents larger than 400 cm^2 . As was discussed above, the fires with larger vents had larger external flame jets. Therefore, the ignition index can be used to predict the potential for external burning, but the occurrence of external burning is dependent on the presence of an ignition source (**i.e.** flame jets) which is dictated by the vent geometry and ~~fire~~ size.

Table 5.2 Calculated ignition index for underventilated hexane compartment fires.

ϕ_{ss}	Ignition Index
1.0	0.6
1.1	0.8
1.1	0.5
1.2	0.7
1.2	0.8
1.3	0.8
1.3	1.0
1.3	0.9
1.3	1.0
1.4	1.1
1.4	1.1
1.5	1.2
1.5	1.2
* 1.7	1.1
1.9	1.4
* 2.0	1.4
2.1	1.5
2.2	1.5
* 2.3	1.3
* 2.5	1.4
2.6	1.6
2.6	1.5
2.6	1.6
* 2.8	1.5
2.8	1.6
* 2.9	1.5
2.9	1.6
* 3.0	1.5

* indicates that hydrocarbons were measured.

Since these underventilated compartment fires had upper layer temperatures of 900 to 1100 K (300 to 600 K higher than Beyler observed), the ignition criteria predicts the potential for external burning to occur at equivalence ratios of about 1.3, which is lower than 1.7 predicted for layer burning in Beyler's experiments. This is to be expected since the lean flammability limit decreases as the temperature of the mixture increases.

It was shown above that the occurrence of sustained external burning was a function of the equivalence ratio, for which the upper layer composition can be correlated. Since the ignition index is primarily a function of the upper layer composition and temperature, it is expected that the onset of sustained external burning is characterized by a distinct ignition index value that is greater than one. In order to determine if a unique value exists, the ignition index was calculated as a function of time for each upper layer-sampled, underventilated fm. For each fire, the ignition index was then evaluated at the time when sustained external burning occurred. The results, presented in Table 5.3, show that when sustained external burning started, the average ignition index for all fms examined was 1.3 ± 0.08 . In a consistent manner, fires that did not have sustained external burning had index values less than 1.2. The results demonstrate that the ignition criterion can be quite useful in identifying when the potential for external burning exists and more importantly the time at which sustained external burning occurs, and thus, a decrease in the CO hazard. As the upper layer composition is correlated with ϕ_p , the ignition index can be said to be a function of the equivalence ratio. Since the index is a function of upper layer temperature also, it is a better means than the equivalence ratio of predicting external burning. This is because the yield-equivalence ratio correlations are dependent on temperature.

Table 5.3 Instantaneous Ignition Index at time which sustained external burning started.

ϕ_{ss}	Ignition Index
1.7	1.2
* 1.9	1.2
* 2.0	1.3
2.2	1.3
* 2.4	1.4
* 2.5	1.3
2.6	1.2
2.6	1.3
* 2.8	1.4
* 2.9	1.4
* 3.0	1.3
AVG:	1.3
STD:	± 0.08

* indicates that hydrocarbons were measured.

For completeness, the occurrence of layer burning was examined in light of the ignition index and the occurrence of external burning. Generally, layer burning was observed to occur prior to the initial flashes of external burning, but always occurred ~~before~~ sustained external burning. The time at which the ignition index obtained a value of 1 was typically within 10 seconds ~~of the time~~ at which layer burning occurred.

Further compartment fire studies with full layer composition measurements are needed to verify the actual index values calculated here, due to the number of assumptions involved with calculating the ignition index and limited ~~data~~. However, the results are very encouraging in indicating that the ignition criterion is a useful tool for predicting compartment fire behavior.

5.4 Summary and Conclusions

The ignition and burning of fuel-rich upper layer gases outside of the fire compartment (external burning) was observed experimentally. Hexane fires were burned in the **2.2** m³ compartment with a window-style exhaust vent to study the effects of external burning on carbon monoxide and smoke yields downstream of the fire compartment. External burning was observed to occur in several modes: 1) intermittent flashes, **2)** bursts that lasted for only a few seconds and 3) sustained external burning. Results showed that the flammability of the compartment ~~fire~~ effluent was a function of the equivalence ratio and that distinguishable equivalence ratios exist that determine which mode of external burning can be obtained for a given compartment fire. Results **also** showed that the reduction of carbon monoxide and smoke only occurs when sustained external burning occurs. For fires which obtained steady-state, plume equivalence ratios above **1.7**, sustained external burning occurred and downstream

carbon monoxide yields were reduced to **10 to 25** percent of the upper layer yields. For equivalence ~~ratios~~ below **1.7**, carbon monoxide yields downstream of a compartment fire were the same **as** upper layer yields even when flashes or short bursts of external burning occurred. During the course of a fire, including times with and without external burning, the production and consumption of smoke downstream of a ~~fire~~ compartment qualitatively followed that of carbon monoxide. For plume equivalence ratios above **1.7**, the downstream smoke yield was reduced to 0 to **50** percent of the level observed prior to ~~sustained~~ external burning.

A study of the transient history of each fire indicated that sustained external burning occurred at ~~an~~ instantaneous ϕ_p of **1.8** for fires with large vents and at ϕ of **2.1** for fires with smaller vents of 400 cm². ~~This~~ was consistent with the observation that the fires with the larger vents had substantial external flame jets which provided an ignition source for external burning to more readily occur.

~~Lastly~~, Beyler's ignition criterion for layer burning was applied to the mixing of the hot fuel-rich, upper layer gases and ambient ~~air~~ outside of the ~~fire~~ compartment. The ~~results~~ show that the ignition index predicts the potential for external burning at equivalence ratios of **1.3** which is in reasonable agreement with the experimental observatory. ~~Of~~ more importance, a unique ignition index value (**1.3**) was identified when sustained external burning started **to** occur for the hexane fires. ~~This~~ provides a means, which is a function of both the equivalence ratio and upper layer temperature, of predicting when the CO hazard is reduced outside of a compartment fire.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary and Conclusions

Experiments were performed to examine the species production **rates** for four fuels (hexane, **PMMA**, spruce and flexible polyurethane foam) burning in a 2.2 m³ compartment. The compartment was **specially** designed to separate the entrained **air** flow from the outflow of upper layer gases. **This** allowed direct measurement of the entrained air rate and, thus, the plume equivalence ratio. Therefore, **this** test facility allowed the study of realistic compartment ~~fire~~ behavior while eliminating the large uncertainty associated with calculating the plume equivalence **ratio** from the ventilation parameter, $Ah^{1/2}$, **as** had been done in the past.

Well-defined, empirical correlations between the upper layer yield of major species and the plume equivalence ratio were shown to exist for these compartment fires. The results reveal that the production of CO is strongly dependent on the compartment flow dynamics and upper layer temperature and less sensitive **to** the fuel **type**. However, **the** production of CO₂ and O₂ **are** dependent on all three parameters but can be represented **as** normalized yields which remove the fuel dependence.

The comparison between correlations obtained in the current work and those developed in simplified upper layer environments (*hood* experiments) show qualitatively **similar** curves but quantitatively different production rates for the **same** equivalence ratio. A comparison between the hood and compartment fire experiments indicated that the **main** difference between fire environments was a substantial **increase** in layer temperature for the enclosure fires. A chemical kinetics analysis of the upper layer was

successful in explaining the differences between correlations and revealing the temperature effect.

The effect of temperatures on compartment fire upper layer compositions appears to be two-fold; 1) the generation of species in the plume is changed and 2) oxidation of post flame gases in the layer is affected. Elevated compartment temperatures correlate to increased plume temperatures and more complete oxidation of the fuel to CO_2 and H_2O within the plume. The layer temperature dictates post flame oxidation in the layer. Temperatures above 875 K allow nearly complete oxidation of CO to CO_2 for overventilated and slightly underventilated conditions. Layer temperatures below 875 K result in freezing out the CO to CO_2 reaction, leaving high CO concentrations. During underventilated conditions, two mechanisms affecting net CO formation compete (CO and hydrocarbon oxidation). Increasing temperature over 875 K depletes CO by accelerating the CO to CO_2 conversion. However, with increasing equivalence ratios, incomplete oxidation of unburned hydrocarbons increases the CO level. Since hydrocarbon oxidation is much faster than CO oxidation, net CO levels in the layer increase with equivalence ratio as unburned hydrocarbon yield from the plume increases.

The carbon monoxide yield correlations obtained for the different fuels appear to be less sensitive to the fuel composition than to temperature. This is indicated by the better agreement between fuels for correlations of CO yield rather than normalized CO yield, which is dependent on the fuel. However, a tendency for oxygenated fuels to produce more CO was observed.

Although the compartment fires were shown to be quasi-steady in nature, correlations between transient CO yield and equivalence ratio showed very good agreement to the correlations obtained from the quasi-steady-state data of all fires. The

results suggest that for very transient conditions, the yield correlations can be used as long as the yields are adjusted for the effective dilution that occurs as ϕ_u lags behind ϕ_p .

The CO yields downstream of hexane compartment fires were investigated and compared to the upper layer yields. Results showed that downstream CO levels can be correlated to the plume equivalence ratio when taking in account the occurrence of external burning.

External burning was observed to occur in several modes: 1) initial intermittent flashes, 2) bursts that lasted for only a few seconds and 3) sustained external burning. Results showed that the flammability of the compartment fire effluent was a function of the equivalence ratio and that distinguishable equivalence ratios exist that determine which mode of external burning can be obtained for a given compartment fire. Results **also** showed that the reduction of carbon monoxide and smoke only **occurred** when sustained external **burning** occurred. Typically, fires obtaining average steady-state equivalence ~~ratios~~ of 1.7 or higher, were observed **to** have sustained external burning and a reduction of downstream CO to **10 to 25** percent of the upper layer yield. For fires with no sustained external burning, carbon monoxide yields downstream of a compartment ~~fire~~ were the same **as** upper layer yields even when flashes or short bursts of external burning occurred.

During the course **of** a fire, including times with and without external burning, the production and consumption of smoke downstream of a ~~fire~~ compartment qualitatively followed that of carbon monoxide. For plume equivalence ratios above 1.7, the downstream smoke yield was reduced to 0 to **50** percent of the level observed prior to sustained external burning.

The use of an ignition criterion, which depends primarily on the upper layer composition and temperature, developed by Beyler appears to be a useful tool in predicting when external burning can occur and, more importantly, when sustained external burning occurs (i.e., a reduction in downstream CO hazard). A unique ignition index value of 13 was identified at which sustained external burning started to occur for all hexane fires studied.

6.2 Recommendations for Future Work

The yield correlations were obtained for compartment fires in which well defined two layer systems developed. Ventilation systems in buildings may cause the two layer environment to break down due to enhanced mixing. Flow dynamics in the compartment would, therefore, be significantly altered; possibly approaching a situation similar to a well-stirred reactor in extreme cases. Experiments need to be performed to determine the effect on species correlations when the two layer environment is destroyed.

Application of the correlations to actual fires is also limited by the inability to define a global equivalence ratio. Calculation of the equivalence ratio requires that the fuel volatile composition be known. This can prove to be a difficult task due to the wide variety of fuel items that can be found in a room. In the case of multiple fuels burning, the problem becomes more complex. Even if the overall volatile composition can be determined for a multiple fuel fire, the effect on the net upper layer yield correlations due to multiple plumes in the compartment is not certain. This becomes more complicated to analyze as plumes are immersed deeper in the upper layer where feed-back mechanisms between plumes and upper layer gases becomes important. Further work in this area is clearly needed.

Due to the number of assumptions involved with calculating the ignition index for external burning and the limited **data** available, further compartment fire studies **with** detailed layer composition measurements **are needed** to verify the actual index values calculated. However, the results are very encouraging in indicating that the ignition criterion is a useful tool for predicting compartment fire behavior.

Further work also needs to be done in examining different geometries outside of the compartment on fire. The window-style exhaust vent used in this study allows sufficient air entrainment for near complete combustion of CO to CO₂ under external burning conditions. Geometries such **as** a ceiling outside the exhaust vent may reduce air entrainment and the efficiency of external flames to destroy CO. It must **also** be noted that the geometry of a window-style vent is not a typical ventilation opening for inside a building. The result of a having a doorway opening is that the layer interface extends out of the room on fire to the adjacent room. Therefore, it is expected that external burning would occur at the Same time **as** layer burning due to the extension of the layer interface out **of** the room.

Lastly, further testing should be done for other fuels. The burning of oxygenated fuels, which tend to produce more CO, **may** result in sustained external burning occurring at lower equivalence ratios due to increased ignition potential.

REFERENCES

1. Hall, J. R., Jr. and A. E. Cote, "America's Fire Problem and Fire Protection," in Fire Protection Handbook, (Ed. A. E. Cote) National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, Mass. (1991).
2. Anderson, R. A., A. A. Watson, and W. A. Harland, "Fire Deaths in Glasgow Area: II The Role of Carbon Monoxide," *Med. Sci. Law*, **21**, 289-294 (1981).
3. Harland, W. A. and Anderson, R. A., "Causes of Death in Fires," Proceedings, Smoke and Toxic Gases from Burning Plastics, 15/1-15/19, London England, Jan 6-7, (1982).
4. Harwood, B. and Hall, J. R., "What Kills in Fires: smoke inhalation or burns?" *Fire Journal*, **83**, 29-34, May/June (1989).
5. Braker, W. and A. L. Mossman, Matheson Gas Data Book, sixth edition, Matheson, Lyndhurst, NJ (1980).
6. Budnick, E. K., "Mobile Home Living Room Fire Studies: The Role of Interior Finish," NBSIR 78-1530, National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, MD (1978).
7. Budnick, E. K., D. P. Klein and R. J. O'Laughlin, "Mobile Home Bedroom Fire Studies: The Role of Interior Finish," NBSIR 78-1531, National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, MD (1978).
8. Kisko, T. M. and D. W. Stroup, "EVACNET+: A Computer Program to Determine Optimal Building Evacuation Plans," *Fire Safety Journal*, **9**, 211-220 (1985).
9. Nelson, H. E., "FPETOOL: Fire Protection Engineering Tools for Fire Estimation," NISTIR 4380, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD (1989).
10. Cooper, L. Y., "Estimating the Environment and the Response of Sprinkler Links in Compartment Fires with Draft Curtains and Fusible-Link-Actuated Ceiling Vents Theory," *Fire Safety Journal*, **16**, 137-163 (1990).
11. Walton, W. D. and Budnick, E. IC, "Deterministic Computer Fire Models" in Fire Protection Handbook, (Ed. A. E. Cote) National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, Mass. (1991).

12. Emmons, H. W., "The Needed Fire Science," in Fire Safety Science - Proceedings of First International Symposium, (Eds. Grant, C. E. and P. J. Pagni) Hemisphere, Washington, D.C. **33-53 (1986).**
13. Toner **S. J.**, E. E. **Zukoski**, and T. Kubota, "Entrainment, Chemistry, and Structure of Fire Plumes," National Institute of Standards and Technology, Center for Fire Research, Report NBS-GCR-87-528 (1987).
14. Beyler, C. L., "Major Species Production by Diffusion Flames in a Two Layer Compartment Fire Environment," Fire Safety Journal, **10, 47-56 (1986).**
15. Beyler, C. L., "Major Species Production by Solid Fuels in a Two Layer Compartment Fire Environment," in Fire Safety Science - Proceedings of First International Symposium, (Eds. Grant, C. E. and P. J. Pagni) Hemisphere, Washington, D.C. **431-430 (1986).**
16. Morehart, J. H., E. E. **Zukoski**, and T. **Kubota**, "Species Produced in Fires Burning in Two-Layered and Homogeneous Vitiated Environments," National Institute of Standards and Technology, Center for Fire Research, Report NBS-GCR-90-585 (1990).
17. Tewarson, A., Twentieth Symposium (International) on Combustion, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, **1555-1566 (1984).**
18. **Zukoski**, E.E., **S. J.** Toner, J. H. Morehart and T. Kubota, "Combustion Processes in Two-Layer Configurations," in Fire Safety Science - Proceedings of Second International Symposium, (Ed. Wakamatsu, T.) Hemisphere, Washington, D.C. **295-304 (1989).**
19. **Zukoski**, E.E., J. H. Morehart, T. Kubota and **S. J.** Toner, "Species Production and Heat Release Rates in Two-Layer Natural Gas Fires," Combustion and Flame **83, 324-332 (1991).**
20. Yokoi, **S.**: Building Research Institute, Report No. **34**, Tokyo (1960).
21. Seigel, L. G.: Fire Technology, **5, 43 (1969).**
22. Thomas, P. H. and Law, M.: Fire Research Note, No. **921 (1972).**
23. **Thomas**, P. H. and Heselden, A. J. M.: Conseil Internationale du Batiment Report No. **20**, Fire Research Note, No. **923 (1972).**

24. Bullen, M. L. and Thomas, P. H.: Seventeenth Symposium (International) on Combustion, p. **1139**, The Combustion Institute (**1978**).
25. Skelly, M. J., "**An** Experimental Investigation of Glass Breakage in Compartment **Fires**," Masters Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and **State** University (**1990**).
26. Fluid Meters: Their Theory and **Application**, Report of A.S.M.E Research **Committee** on Fluid Meters, Sixth edition (Ed. Bean, H. S.), ASME, NY (**1971**).
27. Tewarson, A., "Generation of Heat and Chemical **Compounds** in **Fires**" in The **SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering** (P. J. DiNenno, Ed), National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, (**1988**).
28. "Special Reference Material Report GM **25** and GM **26**," Materials Bank Compendium of **Fire** Property Data, Product Research **Committee** (**1976**).
29. Babrauskas, V., "Burning Rates" in The **SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering** (P. J. DiNenno, Ed), National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, (**1988**).
30. Tewarson, A., Combustion and Flame, **19**,101-111 (**1972**).
31. Quintiere, J. G., B. J. McCaffrey and K. **Den** Braven, Seventeenth Symposium (International) on Combustion, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, **1125-1137** (**1978**).
32. **Gross**, D and Robertson, A. F., Tenth Symposium (International) on Combustion, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, **931-942** (**1965**).
33. Tewarson, A., **Flame Retardant Polymeric Materials**, Vo13 (M. Lewin, **S. M.** Atlas and E. M. Pearce, Eds.), Plenum Press, New **York**, p **97** (**1982**).
34. Kee, R. J., F. M. Rupley and J. A. Miller, Sandia Report **SAND89-8009** (December **1990**).
35. Lutz, A. E., R. J. **Kee** and J. A. Miller, Sandia Report **SAND87-8248** (February **1991**).
36. Pitts, W. M., Twenty-Fourth Symposium (International) on Combustion, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, (**1992**).

37. Miller, J. A. and Bowman, C. T., "Mechanism and Modeling of Nitrogen Chemistry in Combustion," Prog. Energy Combustion Science, **15**, 287-338 (1989).
38. Chakir, A., M. Bellimam, J C. Boettner and M Cathonnet, International Journal of Chemical Kinetics, **24**,385-410 (1992).
39. Dagaut, P., J C. Boettner and M Cathonnet, International Journal of Chemical Kinetics, **22**,641-664 (1990).
40. Yetter, R. A. and F. L. Dryer, Combust. Sci. and Tech., **79**, 97-128, (1991).
41. Yetter, R. A. and F. L. Dryer, Combust. Sci. and Tech., **79**,129-140, (1991).
42. Dagaut, J C. Boettner and M Cathonnet, Combust. Sci. Tech., **77**, 127-148 (1991).
43. Vaughn, C. B., W. H. Sun, J. B. Howard and J. P. Longwell, Combustion and Flame, **84**, 38-46 (1991).
44. Dagaut, M Cathonnet and J C. Boettner, International Journal of Chemical Kinetics, **23**, 437-455 (1991).
45. Norton, T. S. and F. L. Dryer, International Journal of Chemical Kinetics, **24**,319-344 (1992).
46. Drysdale, D., Fire Dynamics, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1985).
47. Beyler, C. L.: Combustion Science and Technology **39**,287 (1984).
48. Beyler, C. L.: Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University (1983).
49. Newman, J. S. and J Steciak, Combustion and Flame, **67**, 55-64 (1987).

APPENDIX A

CALIBRATION OF THE VELOCITY PROBE

The entrained **air** rate into the compartment was measured with a hot film, **0-2m/s** linear velocity probe (Kurz model **415**) with an accuracy of ± 2.5 percent of the reading. The probe was positioned at the point of mean velocity **based on** measured velocity profiles. The flow was turbulent and, thus, the velocity profile was quite flat. The **probe** was calibrated in the experimental setup using a CO gas tracer method.

The general concept of the **gas** tracer method is to measure the total volumetric flow rate **of** gas through a duct by introducing a **known** flow rate of **gas A**, different from the primary **gas**, at the upstream end of the duct and measuring the concentration of **gas A** at the opposite end. Assuming no concentration gradients in the flow, the total flow rate through the duct is equal to the flow rate of gas A divided by the measured mole fraction of gas A.

Carbon monoxide was chosen as a suitable tracer gas since it is not found, in measurable quantities, in **air** and since it could be **measured** with the already available **NDIR** CO analyzer. Due to the fact that the **gas** tracer method provides volumetric flow rate measurements, the velocity probe was calibrated in **terms of** the same measurement. **This** was appropriate since the inlet duct was a fixed **area** and also, since the final quantity desired was the mass entrainment rate of **air**, which equals the volumetric flow rate multiplied by the density.

The calibration setup consisted of using a variable speed fan, just inside the exhaust vent, to produce a range of flows through the compartment. The fan simulated the fire plume in drawing air through the inlet duct, into the test compartment and out the

exhaust vent. Carbon monoxide was introduced into the **air stream** 15 cm in from the upstream end of the inlet duct and the concentration of CO was measured downstream in the air plenum. To insure the CO and air were well mixed prior to entering the plenum, the CO was supplied by four parallel **tubes** evenly distributed in the duct. The end of each tube was capped and four perpendicular holes were drilled around the periphery of the tube near **the** end. Therefore, the CO was injected into the air **stream** at 16 points across the area of the duct. The flow of CO to the duct was measured before and after each run using a *dry gas* test meter (Singer, model **DTM-115**). The measured supplied CO flow rate was accurate to within 2 percent of the value and the CO analyzer was accurate to within 10 ppm on a 1000 ppm range. Typical CO concentrations measured in the calibration procedure were 500 to 700 ppm.

The procedure for calibration was to establish a steady flow of air and the CO tracer through the compartment, and then **record** the CO concentration and the velocity probe output for 120 seconds. Both values were then averaged over time to obtain one **data** set. The velocity probe was calibrated by the manufacturer to have a linear output of 0 to 5 volts corresponding to 0 to 2 m/s. The velocity was multiplied by the duct area to yield the volumetric flow rate. Figure A.1 shows the volumetric flow rate measured by the CO tracer method plotted versus the measurement calculated from the velocity probe. A linear fit to the **data** is also shown in Figure A.1. The sum of the absolute value of the residuals is 0.0376 for 20 **data** points (i.e., a maximum of 6 percent uncertainty associated with the **Linear** fit for the range of flows measured). The equation for the fit follows:

$$Q = 1.235E-2 + 0.9395 * Q_v \quad [A.1]$$

where Q is the volumetric flow rate through the duct and Q_v is the measurement **from** the velocity probe. Using this equation to calculate the entrained **air** flow rate eliminated the

combined uncertainties of correct probe placement and any questions of relying on the manufacturer's calibration. As long as the probe location remained the same, the measured air entrainment rate was not affected by changes in the location of the mean velocity due to varying flow conditions.




Figure A.1 The volumetric flow rate through the inlet duct based on the CO tracer method versus the calculated flow rate based on the velocity probe output. The data is represented with a least-squares linear fit.

APPENDIX B

DATA REDUCTION PROGRAM

The program used to reduce the data obtained **from** the data acquisition system is shown below. The data acquisition system stores all **data** sequentially in **a** single array file. The reduction program first reads in the **raw** data and stores each measured value in **a** separate array before further calculations are performed.

```
C  PROGRAMREDUCE.FOR
C
$LARGE
  IMPLICITREAL*8(A-H,O-Z)
  DIMENSION TIME(1300),DRYCO(1300),DRYCO2(1300),DRYO2(1300)
  DIMENSION FUEL(1300), AIRVEL(1300),TC(14,1300)
  DIMENSION FTOA(1300),UTC(14),SUTC(14)
  DIMENSION FUELRATE(1300), AIRRATE(1300)
  DIMENSION RAWFUEL(1300),RESTIME(1300),Q(1300)
  DIMENSION DEL2FUEL(1300),SMOKE1(1300),SMOKE0(1300)
  DIMENSION FID(1300)
  INTEGER PTSTART, PTSPAST, CONSTANT,I,K,IFUELTYPE,TFLAG
  INTEGER DUCT,AVGFLAG,TIMEFLAG
  PARAMETER (VOLC=1.137, PRESS=15.8, AREA=0.0699573)
  REAL*8 IGNITION,LAYER,MASSODL,NP,NPCP,N2MOLES,NTOTST
  CHARACTER*7 FNAME,RUN
C
C -----
C
C  INITIALIZE VARIABLES
C
  FIDSPAN=1.
  FIDRANGE=0.
  FIDZERO=0.
  FIDCAL=1.
  TOTDUCTMOLES=0.0
  EXMOLES =1.0
  SMOKED=0.0
  SMOKEVF=0.0
  EXTCOEFF=0.0
  SRATIO=0.0
  DO 200 N=1,1000
    SMOKE0(N)=0.0
    SMOKE1(N)=0.0
    FID(N)=0.0
    FUELRATE(N)=0.0
    RESTIME(N)=0.0
  200 CONTINUE
C
C -----
C
C  INPUT RUN PARAMETERS
```

C

```

WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER FILE NAME'
READ(*,15) FNAME
15 FORMAT(A7)
WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER RUN #'
READ(*,*) IRUNNUMBER
WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER CO RANGE 1,2 or 3'
READ(*,*) ICORANGE
WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER CO2 RANGE 1,2 or 3'
READ(*,*) ICO2RANGE
WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER THE RUN TIME PAST END OF FIRE (sec)'
READ(*,*) TIMEPAST
WRITE(*,*) 'COMPARTMENT (1) OR EXHAUST (2) RUN, ENTER 1 or 2'
READ(*,*) IPROBE
IF (IPROBE.EQ.1) THEN
  PROBE='COMPARTMENT'
ELSE
  PROBE='EXHAUST'
ENDIF
IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.86.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.113) THEN
  WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER AMBIENT TEMPERATURE (C)'
  READ(*,*) TAMB
  TAMB = TAMB+273.15
ENDIF
IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.86.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.105) THEN
  WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER UPPER LAYER TEMPERATURE (K)'
  READ(*,*) TEMPUL
ENDIF
WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER AMBIENT PRESSURE'
READ(*,*) PA
WRITE(*,*) 'HEXANE (1), PMMA (2), WOOD (3) OR POLYURETHANE (4) FIRE?'
READ(*,*) IFUELTYPE
IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.1) THEN
  TFUEL = 'HEXANE'
ELSE IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.2) THEN
  TFUEL = 'PMMA'
ELSE IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.3) THEN
  TFUEL = 'WOOD'
ELSE IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.4) THEN
  TFUEL = 'POLYURETHANE'
ENDIF
IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.203) THEN
  WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER THE FID SPAN GAS CONCENTRATION (ppm C2)'
  READ(*,*) FIDSPAN
  WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER THE FID OPERATING RANGE (eg. 1e-9)'
  READ(*,*) FIDRANGE
  WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER THE FID ZERO GAS READING AS mv times the range'
  READ(*,*) FIDZERO
  WRITE(*,*) 'ENTER THE FID SPAN GAS READING AS mv times the range'
  READ(*,*) FIDCAL

```

```

ENDIF
IF(IPROBE.EQ.1) THEN
    PTSTART=9
ELSE
    PTSTART=6
ENDIF
IF(TRUNNUMBER.LE.136) THEN
    PTSTART=6
ENDIF

C  SET VALUES FOR HEXANE FIRE
C
IF(IFUELTYPE.EQ. 1) THEN
    DELHC = 44735.0
END IF

C
C  SET VALUES FOR PMMA FIRE
C
IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ. 2) THEN
    DELHC = 25200.0
END IF

C
C  SET VALUES FOR WOOD FIRE
C
IF(IFUELTYPE.EQ. 3) THEN
    DELHC = 17900.0
ENDIF

C
C  SET VALUES FOR POLYURETHANE FIRE
C
IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ. 4) THEN
    DELHC = 26570.0
ENDIF

C
C  ASSIGN THE APPROPRIATE MAXIMUM VALUE FOR CHOSEN ANALYZER RANGE
C
O2CONSTANT=100.0
O2GAS=.02*4.74
IF(ICORANGE.EQ.1) THEN
    CORANGE=1000.0
    COCONSTANT=1000000.0
ENDIF
IF(ICORANGE.EQ.2) THEN
    CORANGE=1,
    COCONSTANT=100,
ENDIF
IF(ICORANGE.EQ.3) THEN
    CORANGE=10,

```

```

        COCONSTANT=100.
    ENDIF
    IF(ICO2RANGE.EQ.1) THEN
        CO2RANGE=2.
        CO2CONSTANT=100.
    ENDIF
    IF(ICO2RANGE.EQ.2) THEN
        CO2RANGE=15.
        CO2CONSTANT=100.
    ENDIF
    IF(ICO2RANGE.EQ.3) THEN
        CO2RANGE=20.
        CO2CONSTANT=100.
    ENDIF
C
C
C -----
C
C   INPUT FILE AND CREATE AN ARRAY FOR EACH CHANNEL
C
C
C   I IS THE NUMBER OF DATA POINTS PER CHANNEL
    I=1
    OPEN(5,FILE=FNAME)
    IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.137) THEN
10      READ(5,*,END=20) TIME(I)
        READ(5,*) DRYCO(I)
        READ(5,*) DRYCO2(I)
        READ(5,*) DRYO2(I)
        READ(5,*) FUEL(I)
        READ(5,*) AIRVEL(I)
        READ(5,*) FID(I)
        READ(5,*) SMOKE0(I)
        READ(5,*) SMOKE1(I)
        READ(5,*) TC(1,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(2,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(3,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(4,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(5,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(6,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(7,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(8,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(9,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(10,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(11,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(12,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(13,I)
        READ(5,*) TC(14,I)
        I=I+1
        GOTO 10
20      I=I-1

```

```

ELSE IF(IRUNNUMBER.LT.137) THEN
IF(IRUNNUMBER.GE.106.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.113)THEN
12      READ(5,*,END=23) TIME(I)
        READ(5,*) DRYCO(I)
        READ(5,*) DRYCO2(I)
        READ(5,*) DRYO2(I)
        READ(5,*) FUEL(I)
        READ(5,*) AIRVEL(I)
        READ(5,*) DUMPRESS
        READ(5,*) TCJ1
        READ(5,*) TCJ2
        READ(5,*) TCJ3
        READ(5,*) TCJ4
        READ(5,*) TCJ5
        READ(5,*) TCJ6
        READ(5,*) TCJ7
        READ(5,*) TCJ8
        READ(5,*) TCJ9
        READ(5,*) TCJ10
        READ(5,*) TCJ11
        READ(5,*) TCJ12

        IF(IRUNNUMBER.EQ.106.OR.IRUNNUMBER.EQ.107)THEN
            TC(1,J)=TCJ2
            TC(2,J)=TCJ3
            TC(3,J)=TCJ4
            TC(4,J)=TCJ5
            TC(5,J)=TCJ6
            TC(6,J)=TCJ7
            TC(7,J)=TCJ8
            TC(8,J)=TCJ9
            TC(9,J)=TCJ10
            TC(10,J)=0.
            TC(11,J)=TCJ11
            TC(12,J)=TCJ12
        ENDIF

        IF(IRUNNUMBER.EQ.108.OR.IRUNNUMBER.EQ.109)THEN
            TC(1,J)=TCJ3
            TC(2,J)=TCJ4
            TC(3,J)=TCJ2
            TC(4,J)=TCJ5
            TC(5,J)=TCJ6
            TC(6,J)=TCJ7
            TC(7,J)=TCJ8
            TC(8,J)=TCJ9
            TC(9,J)=TCJ10
            TC(10,J)=0.0
            TC(11,J)=TCJ12
            TC(12,J)=TCJ11
        ENDIF

```

```

IF(IRUNNUMBER.GE.110.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.113)THEN
    TC(1,J)=TCJ2
    TC(2,J)=TCJ3
    TC(3,J)=TCJ4
    TC(4,J)=TCJ5
    TC(5,J)=TCJ6
    TC(6,J)=TCJ7
    TC(7,J)=TCJ8
    TC(8,J)=TCJ9
    TC(9,J)=TCJ10
    TC(10,J)=0.0
    TC(11,J)=TCJ12
    TC(12,J)=TCJ11
ENDIF

    I=I+1
    GOTO 12
23      I=I-1
      ELSE

11      READ(5,*,END=21) TIME(I)
          READ(5,*) DRYCO(I)
          READ(5,*) DRYCO2(I)
          READ(5,*) DRYO2(I)
          READ(5,*) FUEL(I)
          READ(5,*) AIRVEL(I)
          READ(5,*) DUMPRESS
          READ(5,*) TC(1,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(2,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(3,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(4,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(5,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(6,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(7,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(8,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(9,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(10,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(11,I)
          READ(5,*) TC(12,I)
          I=I+1
          GOTO 11
21      I=I-1
      ENDIF
      ENDIF
      CLOSE (5)

```

```

C
C -----
C

```



```

C DATA MANIPULATION FOR EACH CHANNEL LOOP J=1 to I
C
C
C PTSPAST=NINT(TIMEPAST/1.97)
C
C K=PTSTART
C DO 30J=1,I

TC(1,J)=TC(1,J)+273.15
TC(2,J)=TC(2,J)+273.15
TC(3,J)=TC(3,J)+273.15
TC(4,J)=TC(4,J)+273.15
TC(5,J)=TC(5,J)+273.15
TC(6,J)=TC(6,J)+273.15
TC(7,J)=TC(7,J)+273.15
TC(8,J)=TC(8,J)+273.15
TC(9,J)=TC(9,J)+273.15
TC(10,J)=TC(10,J)+273.15
TC(11,J)=TC(11,J)+273.15
TC(12,J)=TC(12,J)+273.15
TC(13,J)=TC(13,J)+273.15
TC(14,J)=TC(14,J)+273.15

C
C CO ANALZER
C
C IF(DRYCO(K).LT.0.0)THEN
C DRYCO(K)=0.0
C ENDIF
C DRYCO(J)=(DRYCO(K)/5.0)*CORANGE/COCONSTANT
C
C CO2 ANALZER
C
C DRYCO2(K)=DRYCO2(K)
C IF(DRYCO2(K).LT.0.0)THEN
C DRYCO2(K)=0.0
C ENDIF
C DRYCO2(J)=(DRYCO2(K)/5.0)*CO2RANGE/CO2CONSTANT
C
C O2 ANALZER
C
C O2=DRYO2(K)
C IF(DRYO2(K).LT.0.0)THEN
C DRYO2(K)=0.0
C ENDIF
C IF(IRUNNUMBER.LE.52.OR.IRUNNUMBER.EQ.211)THEN
C O2RANGE=0.5
C ELSE
C O2RANGE=22.0

```

```

      ENDIF
      DRYO2(J)=(DRYO2(K)/5.08)*O2RANGE/O2CONSTANT
C
C   FUEL WEIGHT (kg)
C
      FUEL(J)=(FUEL(J)-1.0)*10.0/4.0
      RAWFUEL(J) = FUEL(J)
C
C   INLET AIR VELOCITY (m/s)
C
      IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.86.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.113) THEN
        AIRVEL(J)=(AIRVEL(J)/5.0)*5.1*TAMB/PA
      ELSE
        AIRVEL(J)=(AIRVEL(J)/5.0)*5.1*TC(12,J)/PA
      ENDIF
C
C
C   ADJUST THC MEASUREMENTS FOR THE ANALYZER DELAY TIME
C
C
      IF (IPROBE.EQ.1) THEN
        FID(J)=FID(K-3)
      ELSE
        FID(J)=FID(K)
      ENDIF
      IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.220.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.223) THEN
        FID(J)=FID(K+2)
      ENDIF
C
C
      K=K+1
30 CONTINUE
C
C   ELIMINATE INCORRECT FUEL DATA POINTS
C
      DO 65 J=2,I
        IF(FUEL(J+1).GT.FUEL(J)) THEN
          FUEL(J)=(FUEL(J-1)+FUEL(J+1))/2.0
          GOTO 65
        ENDIF
      65 CONTINUE
C
C   -----
C   CALCULATE FUEL BURN RATE (kg/sec)
C
      DO 90 J=8,(I-PTSPAST-5)
        FUELRATE(J)=(FUEL(J-5)-FUEL(J+5))/(TIME(J+5)-TIME(J-5))
      90 CONTINUE
C
      DO 95 J=1,7

```

```

        FUELRATE(J)=FUELRATE(8)
95 CONTINUE
C
    DO 97 J=(I-PTSPAST-4),(I-PTSPAST-2)
        FUELRATE(J)=(FUEL(J-2)-FUEL(J+2))/(TIME(J+2)-TIME(J-2))
97 CONTINUE
C
    DELTIME=TIME(I-PTSPAST)-TIME(I-PTSPAST-2)
    FUELRATE(I-PTSPAST-1)=(FUEL(I-PTSPAST-2)-FUEL(I-PTSPAST))/DELTIME
    DELTIME2=TIME(I-PTSPAST)-TIME(I-PTSPAST-1)
    FUELRATE(I-PTSPAST)=(FUEL(I-PTSPAST-1)-FUEL(I-PTSPAST))/DELTIME2
    DO 100 J=(I-PTSPAST+1),I
        FUELRATE(J)=0.0
100 CONTINUE
    IF (IRUNNUMBER .GE. 137) THEN
        SRATIO=0.0
        DO 110 J=1,5
            SRATIO = SRATIO + SMOKE1(J)
110    CONTINUE
        SRATIO = SRATIO/5.
    END IF
C
C
C -----
C  CREATE OUTPUT FILES

    DO 140 J=1,5
        FNAME(7:7) = CHAR(64+J)
        OPEN(UNIT=J, FILE = FNAME, STATUS='NEW')
140 CONTINUE

    DIV    = 0.0
    TIMEFLAG = 2
    SMKMAX = 0.0

    DO150 K=1,I
        IF (AVGFLAG .EQ. 1) THEN
            IF (TIME(K) .GE. START-1. .AND. TIME(K) .LE. END+1.) THEN
                TIMEFLAG = 1
            ELSE
                TIMEFLAG = 2
            END IF
        END IF

C
C  CALCULATE HEAT RELEASE RATE (kW)
C
        Q(K) = FUELRATE(K)*DELHC
C
C -----
C  CALCULATE AIR FLOWRATE (kg/sec)

```

```

C          AND RESIDENCE TIME (sec)
C
      IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.86.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.113) THEN
        DENSITY=(PA/TAMB/0.287)*0.1333
      ELSE
        DENSITY=(PA/TC(12,K)/0.287)*0.1333
      ENDIF
      IF (AIRVEL(K).LE. 0.0) THEN
        RESTIME(K) = 999.
      ELSE
        IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.86.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.105) THEN
          RESTIME(K) = VOLC/(AIRVEL(K)*AREA*TEMPUL/TAMB)
        USE
          RESTIME(K) = VOLC/(AIRVEL(K)*AREA*TC(3,K)/TC(12,K))
        ENDIF
        IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.106.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.113) THEN
          RESTIME(K) = VOLC/(AIRVEL(K)*AREA*TC(3,K)/TAMB)
        ENDIF
      ENDIF

      AIRVOLRATE=AIRVEL(K)*AREA
      CORRAIRVOLRATE=0.0123508+AIRVOLRATE*0.939457
      AIRRATE(K)=CORRAIRVOLRATE*DENSITY
      AIRRATE(K)=AIRVEL(K)*DENSITY*AREA
C
C
C  CALCULATE FUEL/AIR RATIO
C
      IF (AIRVEL(K).LE. 0.0) THEN
        FTOA(K) = 0.0
      USE
        FTOA(K)=FUELRATE(K)/AIRRATE(K)
      ENDIF

C
C
C  -----
C
C  VOLUMETRICFLOWRATE (m^3/s) IN EXHAUST DUCT
C
      EXMOLES = (AIRRATE(K)+FUELRATE(K))/28.97
      DUCTFLOW = 1.95147*0.62*DSQRT(PRESS*TC(10,K)/PA)
      TOTDUCTMOLES = DUCTFLOW*PA*0.1333/28.97/.287/TC(10,K)

C  CALCULATE WET CONCENTRATIONS and YIELDS

      IF (IPROBE.EQ.1) THEN
        IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.1) THEN
          DENOM=1.0+(1.167*DRYCO2(K))
          IF (IRUNNUMBER.EQ.55.OR.IRUNNUMBER.EQ.59) THEN
            DENOM=1.0+(1.167*0.10)
          ENDIF
          IF (IRUNNUMBER.EQ.55.OR.IRUNNUMBER.EQ.55) THEN

```

```

        DENOM=1.0+(1.167*0.10)
    ENDIF
    IF(IRUNNUMBER.EQ.65)THEN
        DENOM=1.0+(1.167*0.085)
    ENDIF
    ELSE IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.2) THEN
        DENOM=1.0+(0.8*DRYCO2(K))
        IF(IRUNNUMBER.GE.106.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.114)THEN
            DENOM=1.11111
        ENDIF
    ELSE IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.3) THEN
        DENOM =1.0+(1.792*DRYCO2(K))
    ELSE
        DENOM = 1.0+((0.87)*DRYCO2(K))
    ENDIF

    WETCO=DRYCO(K)/DENOM
    WETCO2=DRYCO2(K)/DENOM
    WETO2=DRYO2(K)/DENOM

ELSE

    WETCO=DRYCO(K)
    WETCO2=DRYCO2(K)
    WETO2=DRYO2(K)
ENDIF

IF(FUELRATE(K).EQ.0) THEN
    COYIELD=0
    CO2YIELD=0
    O2YIELD=0
ELSE
    IF (IPROBE.EQ.1) THEN
C      upper layer-sampled
        COYIELD=WETCO*EXMOLES*28./FUELRATE(K)
        CO2YIELD=WETCO2*EXMOLES*44./FUELRATE(K)
        O2YIELD=((21*AIRRATE(K)*32./28.97)-(WETO2*EXMOLES*32.))
$      /FUELRATE(K)

    ELSE
C      downstream-sampled
        COYIELD=(WETCO*(TOTDUCTMOLES)*(28.))/FUELRATE(K)
        CO2YIELD=((WETCO2-.00035)*(TOTDUCTMOLES)*(44.))/FUELRATE(K)
        O2YIELD=0.0
    ENDIF
ENDIF

IF(CO2YIELD.GT. 100) THEN
    CO2YIELD = 999.
ENDIF
IF(COYIELD.GT. 100) THEN

```

```

      COYIELD=999.
ENDIF
      IF(O2YIELD.GT.100) THEN
        O2YIELD=999.
      ENDIF

C-----
C
C CALCULATE SMOKE VOLUME FRACTION for runs 137 on
C smoke vol fraction is in ppb
C
      IF(IRUNNUMBER.GE.137) THEN

        IF(SMOKE1(K).EQ.0.) THEN
          EXTCOEFF= 999.
          SMOKEVF = 999.
        ELSE
          EXTCOEFF = 2.18723*DLOG(SRATIO/SMOKE1(K))
          SMOKEVF = 1.3697E-07*EXTCOEFF* 1.0E+9
          IF(SMOKEVF.LE.0.) THEN
            SMOKEVF=0.0
          ENDIF
          IF(SMOKEVF.GT.SMKMAX.AND.TIME(K).LE. END+ 1) THEN
            SMKMAX = SMOKEVF
            IF (FUELRATE(K).NE.0) THEN
              CINSMOKE = 4282.8*SMKMAX/FUELRATE(K)/1.E+9
            ENDIF
          ENDIF
        ENDIF

C
C
C CALCULATE SMOKE YIELD ACCORDING TO TEWARSON
C
      IF(FUELRATE(K).EQ.0.) THEN
        SMKYIELD = 999.
      ELSE
        ODL = EXTCOEFF/2.303
        MASSODL = ODL * DUCTFLOW / (FUELRATE(K)*1000.)
        SEC = 3.213/(0.67* 1.1)
        CS = ODL/SEC
        GF = FUELRATE(K)*1000.
        SMKYIELD = CS * DUCTFLOW/GF
      ENDIF
    ENDIF
  ENDIF

C
C EQUIVALENCE RATIO FOR HEXANE
C
      IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.1) THEN
        EQUVALENCE=FTOA(K)* 15.2222
      ENDIF

```

```

C  EQUIVALENCE RATIO FOR PMMA
C
      ELSE IF (FUELTYPE.EQ.2) THEN
        EQUIVALENCE=FTOA(K)*8.2824
C
C  EQUIVALENCE RATIO FOR WOOD - ASSUMES 15%CHAR
C
      ELSE IF (FUELTYPE.EQ.3) THEN
        EQUIVALENCE=FTOA(K)*3.823
C
C  EQUIVALENCE RATIO FOR POLYURETHANE - ASSUMES NO CHAR
C
      ELSE IF (FUELTYPE.EQ.4) THEN
        EQUIVALENCE=FTOA(K)*8.83
C
      ENDIF

      IF(EQUIVALENCE.LT.0.0) THEN
        EQUIVALENCE = 0.0
      END IF

C
C-----
C  CALCULATE DERIVATIVE OF FUEL BURNING RATE
C
      IF (K.LE.7) THEN
        DEL2FUEL(K)=0.0
      ENDIF
      IF (K.GE.I-PTSPAST-4) THEN
        DEL2FUEL(K)=0.0
      ELSE
        DEL2FUEL(K)=(FUELRATE(K+5)-FUELRATE(K-5))/(TIME(J+5)-TIME(J-5))
      ENDIF

C
C-----
C  STEADY STATE TIME RATIO
C
      IF (FUELRATE(K).EQ. 0.0) THEN
        FUELRATE(K) = 0.00001
      ENDIF
      SSTIME=RESTIME(K)*DEL2FUEL(K)/FUELRATE(K)
      IF (ABS(SSTIME).GT. 10.) THEN
        SSTIME = 10.
      END IF

C-----

```

```

C  CALCULATE UNBURNED HYDROCARBONS (mole fraction) and YIELD

  IF (IRUNNUMBER.LT.203) THEN
    THC=0.0
    THCYIELD=0.0
    GOTO 13
  ENDIF
  IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.203) THEN
    IF (FID(K).EQ.0.0) THEN
      THC=0.0
      THCYIELD=0.0
      GOTO 13
    ENDIF
    THC=(FIDSPAN/(FIDCAL-FIDZERO))*((FID(K)* 1000.*FIDRANGE)-FIDZERO)/
$      1000000.0

    THCYIELD=(THC*(AIRRATE(K)+FUELRATE(K))*(28.05/28.97))/FUELRATE(K)
  ENDIF

C-----
C  CARBONBALANCECHECK
C
C
C  13  IF(FUELRATE(K).EQ.0) THEN
      CERROR=999,
      GOTO 9
    ENDIF

C
C  MOLES OF CARBON ORIGINATING FROM FUEL
C
C  for Hexane
    IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.1) THEN
      CMOLIN=6.0*FUELRATE(K)/86.0
C  for PMMA
    ELSE IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.2) THEN
      CMOLIN=5.0*FUELRATE(K)/100.0
C  for Wood
    ELSE IF (IFUELTYPE.EQ.3) THEN
      CMOLIN=FUELRATE(K)/40.428
C  for Polyurethane
    ELSE
      CMOLIN=FUELRATE(K)/19.91
    ENDIF
    IF (CMOLIN.EQ.0.) THEN
      CERROR=999
      GOTO 9
    ENDIF

C  MOLES ACCOUNTED FOR BY MEASUREMENTS
C  if compartment sampled
    IF (IPROBE EQ. 1) THEN

```



```

      CMOLOUT=(WETCO + WETCO2 + 2.*THC)*EXMOLES
    ELSE
C    if exhaust sampled
      CMOLOUT=(WETCO + WETCO2-0.00035 + 2.*THC)*TOTDUCTMOLES
    ENDIF
    CERROR=(CMOLOUT-CMOLIN)*100.0/CMOLIN
    IF (ABS(CERROR).GT. 999) THEN
      CERROR = 999
    ENDIF
  9 CONTINUE

C-----
C  IGNITION INDEX CALCULATION for Hexane fires
C
  IF (IPROBE.EQ. 1) THEN
    WETH2O = 1.167*WETCO2
    H2OMOLES = WETH2O*EXMOLES
    COMOLES = WETCO*EXMOLES
    CO2MOLES = WETCO2*EXMOLES
    O2MOLES = WETO2*EXMOLES

    IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.203) THEN
      THCMOLES = THC*EXMOLES
    USE
    IF (EQUIVALENCE.LE. 1.) THEN
      THCMOLES = 0.
      THC = 0.0
    ELSE
      THCMOLES = 3.0*FUELRATE(K)*(1.-(1./EQUIVALENCE))/86.
      THC = THCMOLES/EXMOLES
    ENDIF
  ENDIF

  H2MOLES = 0.5 * COMOLES
  WETH2 = H2MOLES/EXMOLES
  N2MOLES = EXMOLES-(COMOLES+CO2MOLES+O2MOLES+H2OMOLES+THCMOLES
$      +H2MOLES)
    WETN2 = N2MOLES/EXMOLES

  ALPHA = 0.5*(WETCO+WETH2)+3.*THC-WETO2
  NTOTST = 1.+ALPHA*4.76
  XCOST = WETCO/NTOTST
  XH2ST = WETH2/NTOTST
  XTHCST = THC/NTOTST
  NP = (WETCO+WETCO2+4.*THC+WETH2O+WETH2+WETN2+ALPHA*3.76)/NTOTST
  NPCP = ((WETCO+WETCO2+2.*THC)*54.3+(2.*THC+WETH2O+WETH2)*
$      41.2+(WETN2+ALPHA*3.76)*32.7)*NP/NTOTST

  IF (IRUNNUMBER.GE.86.AND.IRUNNUMBER.LE.105) THEN
    TO = (TEMPUL+ALPHA*4.76*320.)/NTOTST
  ELSE

```

```

      TEMPUL = (TC(1,K)+TC(2,K)+TC(3,K)+TC(4,K))/4.
      T0 = (TEMPUL+ALPHA*4.76*320.)/NTOTST
    ENDIF

      IGNITION = XCOST*283000/NPCP/(1450-T0) +
$      XTHCST*1411000/NPCP/(1700-T0) +
$      XH2ST*242000/NPCP/(1080-T0)
    ELSE
      IGNITION = 0.0
    ENDIF

```

```

C-----
C  STORE DATA

```

```

      WRITE(1,1000)TIME(K),WETCO,WETCO2,WETO2,COYIELD,CO2YIELD,O2YIELD,
$EQUIVALENCE,SMKYIELD,THCYIELD
      WRITE(2,1100)TIME(K),FUEL(K),FUELRATE(K),AIRVEL(K),AIRRATE(K),
$DEL2FUEL(K),CERROR,Q(K)
      WRITE(3,1200)TIME(K),TC(1,K),TC(2,K),TC(3,K),TC(4,K),TC(5,K),
$   TC(6,K),TC(7,K),TC(8,K),TC(9,K),TC(10,K),TC(11,K),TC(12,K)
      WRITE(4,1300)TIME(K),RESTIME(K),SSTIME,
$DRYCO(K),DRYCO2(K),DRYO2(K),TC(13,K),TC(14,K),THC,SMOKEVF,
$TOTDUCTMOLES/EXMOLES
      WRITE(5,1400)TIME(K),SMOKE0(K),SMOKE1(K),EXTCOEFF,WETH2O,WETH2,
$   IGNITION

```

```

1000 FORMAT(F7.1,3E9.3,F6.4,2F9.4,F7.3,F8.3,F6.4)
1100 FORMAT(F7.1,F9.3,F9.4,F9.2,F9.3,F8.5,F10.2,F9.2)
1200 FORMAT(F7.1,12F6.0)
1300 FORMAT(F7.1,F5.1,F6.2,3E9.3,2F6.0,F9.6,F7.2,F5.1)
1400 FORMAT(F7.1,6F10.3)
150 CONTINUE

```

```

      CLOSE (1)
      CLOSE (2)
      CLOSE (3)
      CLOSE (4)
      CLOSE (5)

```

```

      WRITE(*,*)'DATA MANIPULATION COMPLETED '
      END

```

APPENDIX C

Reaction Mechanism

The reaction mechanism used for the chemical kinetics study presented in Chapter 4 is shown below. The mechanism is a subset of the one used by Miller and Bowman [37], and reactions are numbered according to this reference.

Reaction ~~Mechanism~~ Rate Coefficients

$$k_r = AT^{\beta} \exp(-E/RT)$$

Units: moles, cm³, s, K, cal/mole

	Reaction	A	P	E
1.	2CH ₃ + M = C ₂ H ₆ + M H ₂ /2.0/ CO/2.0/ CO ₂ /3.0/ H ₂ O/5.0/	9.03E+16	-1.180	654.
2.	CH ₃ + H + M = CH ₄ + M H ₂ /2.0/ CO/2.0/ CO ₂ /3.0/ H ₂ O/5.0/	6.00E+16	-1.000	0.
3.	CH ₄ + O ₂ = CH ₃ + HO ₂	7.90E+13	0.000	56000.
4.	CH ₄ + H = CH ₃ + H ₂	2.20E+04	3.000	8750.
5.	CH ₄ + OH = CH ₃ + H ₂ O	1.60E+06	2.100	2460.
5a.	CH ₄ + O = CH ₃ + OH	1.02E+09	1.500	8604.
6.	CH ₄ + HO ₂ = CH ₃ + H ₂ O ₂	1.80E+11	0.000	18700.
7.	CH ₃ + HO ₂ = CH ₃ O + OH	2.00E+13	0.000	0.
8.	CH ₃ + O ₂ = CH ₃ O + O	2.05E+19	-1.570	29229.
9.	CH ₃ + O = CH ₂ O + H	8.00E+13	0.000	0.
10.	CH ₂ OH + H = CH ₃ + OH	1.00E+14	0.000	0.
11.	CH ₃ O + H = CH ₃ + OH	1.00E+14	0.000	0.
12.	CH ₃ + OH = CH ₂ + H ₂ O	7.50E+06	2.000	5000.
13.	CH ₃ + H = CH ₂ + H ₂	9.00E+13	0.000	15100.
14.	CH ₃ O + M = CH ₂ O + H + M	1.00E+14	0.000	25000.
15.	CH ₂ OH + M = CH ₂ O + H + M	1.00E+14	0.000	25000.
16.	CH ₃ O + H = CH ₂ O + H ₂	2.00E+13	0.000	0.
17.	CH ₂ OH + H = CH ₂ O + H ₂	2.00E+13	0.000	0.
18.	CH ₃ O + OH = CH ₂ O + H ₂ O	1.00E+13	0.000	0.
19.	CH ₂ OH + OH = CH ₂ O + H ₂ O	1.00E+13	0.000	0.
20.	CH ₃ O + O = CH ₂ O + OH	1.00E+13	0.000	0.
21.	CH ₂ OH + O = CH ₂ O + OH	1.00E+13	0.000	0.
22.	CH ₃ O + O ₂ = CH ₂ O + HO ₂	6.30E+10	0.000	2600.
23.	CH ₂ OH + O ₂ = CH ₂ O + HO ₂	1.48E+13	0.000	1500.
24.	CH ₂ + H = CH + H ₂	1.00E+18	-1.560	0.
25.	CH ₂ + OH = CH + H ₂ O	1.13E+07	2.000	3000.
26.	CH ₂ + OH = CH ₂ O + H	2.50E+13	0.000	0.
27.	CH + O ₂ = HCO + O	3.30E+13	0.000	0.
28.	CH + O = CO + H	5.70E+13	0.000	0.
29.	CH + OH = HCO + H	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
30.	CH + CO ₂ = HCO + CO	3.40E+12	0.000	690.
31.	CH + H = C + H ₂	1.50E+14	0.000	0.
32.	CH + H ₂ O = CH ₂ O + H	1.17E+15	0.750	0.
33.	CH + CH ₂ O = CH ₂ CO + H	9.46E+13	0.000	-515.
34.	CH + C ₂ H ₂ = C ₃ H ₂ + H	1.00E+14	0.000	0.
35.	CH + CH ₂ = C ₂ H ₂ + H	4.00E+13	0.000	0.
36.	CH + C ₂ H ₃ = C ₂ H ₃ + H	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
37.	CH + CH ₄ = C ₂ H ₄ + H	6.00E+13	0.000	0.
38.	C + O ₂ = CO + O	2.00E+13	0.000	0.
39.	C + OH = CO + H	5.00E+13	0.000	0.
40.	C + C ₂ H ₃ = C ₂ H ₂ + H	5.00E+13	0.000	0.
41.	C + CH ₂ = C ₂ H + H	5.00E+13	0.000	0.
42.	CH ₂ + CO ₂ = CH ₂ O + CO	1.10E+11	0.000	1000.

43.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O} = \text{CO} + \text{H}$	5.00E+13	0.000	0.
44.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O} = \text{CO} + \text{H}_2$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
45.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CO}_2 + 2\text{H}$	1.60E+12	0.000	1000.
46.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{O}$	5.00E+13	0.000	9000.
47.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2$	6.90E+11	0.000	500.
48.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	1.90E+10	0.000	-1000.
49.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CO} + \text{OH} + \text{H}$	8.60E+10	0.000	-500.
50.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{HCO} + \text{OH}$	4.30E+10	0.000	-500.
51.	$\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{OH} = \text{HCO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	3.43E+09	1.180	-447.
52.	$\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H} = \text{HCO} + \text{H}_2$	2.19E+08	1.70	3000.
53.	$\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{M} = \text{HCO} + \text{H} + \text{M}$	3.31E+16	0.000	81000.
54.	$\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{O} = \text{HCO} + \text{OH}$	1.80E+13	0.000	3080.
55.	$\text{HCO} + \text{OH} = \text{H} + \text{CO}$	1.00E+14	0.000	0.
56.	$\text{HCO} + \text{M} = \text{H} + \text{CO} + \text{M}$ O/1.9/ H ₂ /1.9/ CH ₄ /2.8/ CO ₂ /3.0/ H ₂ O/5.0/	2.50E+14	0.000	16802.
57.	$\text{HCO} + \text{H} = \text{CO} + \text{H}_2$	1.19E+13	0.250	0.
58.	$\text{HCO} + \text{O} = \text{CO} + \text{OH}$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
59.	$\text{HCO} + \text{O} = \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
60.	$\text{HCO} + \text{O}_2 = \text{HO}_2 + \text{CO}$	3.30E+13	-0.400	0.
61.	$\text{CO} + \text{O} + \text{M} = \text{CO}_2 + \text{M}$	6.17E+14	0.000	3000.
62.	$\text{CO} + \text{OH} = \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}$	1.51E+07	1.300	-758.
63.	$\text{CO} + \text{O}_2 = \text{CO}_2 + \text{O}$	1.60E+13	0.000	41000.
64.	$\text{HO}_2 + \text{CO} = \text{CO}_2 + \text{OH}$	5.80E+13	0.000	22934.
65.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{CH}_3 = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{CH}_4$	5.50E-01	4.000	8300.
66.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{H} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{H}_2$	5.40E+02	3.500	5210.
67.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{O} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{OH}$	3.00E+07	2.000	5115.
68.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{OH} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	8.70E+09	1.050	1810.
69.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{H} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{H}_2$	1.10E+14	0.000	8500.
70.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{O} = \text{CH}_3 + \text{HCO}$	1.60E+09	1.200	746.
71.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{OH} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	2.02E+13	0.000	5955.
72.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{CH}_3 = \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{H}$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
73.	$\text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{M}$ H ₂ /2.0/ CO/2.0/ CO ₂ /3.0/ H ₂ O/5.0/	2.21E+13	0.000	2066.
74.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{H} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6$	1.00E+14	0.000	0.
75.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{O}_2 = \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{HO}_2$	8.43E+11	0.000	3875.
76.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{O} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{CO}$	1.02E+07	2.000	1900.
77.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{O} = \text{HCCO} + \text{H}$	1.02E+07	2.000	1900.
78.	$\text{H}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}$	4.09E+05	2390	864.
79.	$\text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{M}$ H ₂ /2.0/ CO/2.0/ CO ₂ /3.0/ H ₂ O/5.0/	5.54E+12	0.000	2410.
80.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{H} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2$	4.00E+13	0.000	0.
81.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{O} = \text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{H}$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
82.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{HCO}$	4.00E+12	0.000	-250.
83.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{OH} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	5.00E+12	0.000	0.
84.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{CH}_2 = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_3$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
85.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H} = 2\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
86.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{CH} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2$	5.00E+13	0.000	0.
87.	$\text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	3.37E+07	2.000	14000.
88.	$\text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{HCCOH} + \text{H}$	5.04E+05	2300	13500.
89.	$\text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{H}$	0.218E-03	4.500	-1000.
90.	$\text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{CH}_3 + \text{CO}$	0.483E-03	4.000	-2000.
91.	$\text{HCCOH} + \text{H} = \text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{H}$	1.000E+13	0.000	0.
92.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{O} = \text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{OH}$	3.16E+15	-0.600	15000.
93.	$\text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{H} = \text{CH}_3 + \text{CO}$	1.13E+13	0.000	3428.
94.	$\text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{O} = \text{CO}_2 + \text{CH}_2$	1.75E+12	0.000	1350.

95.	$\text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{H} = \text{HCCO} + \text{H}_2$	5.00E+13	0.000	8000.
96.	$\text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{O} = \text{HCCO} + \text{OH}$	1.00E+13	0.000	8000.
97.	$\text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{OH} = \text{HCCO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	7.50E+12	0.000	2000.
98.	$\text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{M} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{CO} + \text{M}$	3.00E+14	0.000	70980.
99.	$\text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{O}_2 = 2\text{CO} + \text{H}$	5.00E+13	0.000	1500.
100.	$\text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{C}_4\text{H}_2 + \text{H}$	0.300E+14	0.000	0.
101.	$\text{H} + \text{HCCO} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{CO}$	1.00E+14	0.000	0.
102.	$\text{O} + \text{HCCO} = \text{H} + 2\text{CO}$	1.00E+14	0.000	0.
103.	$\text{HCCO} + \text{O}_2 = 2\text{CO} + \text{OH}$	1.60E+12	0.000	854.
104.	$\text{CH} + \text{HCCO} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{CO}$	5.00E+13	0.000	0.
105.	$2\text{HCCO} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + 2\text{CO}$	1.00E+13	0.000	0.
106.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{M} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{M}$	1.00E+13	0.000	0.
107.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{CH}_4 = 2\text{CH}_3$	4.00E+13	0.000	0.
108.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 = \text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_5$	1.20E+14	0.000	0.
109.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CO} + \text{OH} + \text{H}$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
110.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2 = \text{CH}_3 + \text{H}$	7.00E+13	0.000	0.
111.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{H} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{H}$	2.00E+14	0.000	0.
112.	$\text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{O} = \text{CH} + \text{CO}$	5.00E+13	0.000	0.
113.	$\text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{OH} = \text{HCCO} + \text{H}$	2.00E+13	0.000	0.
114.	$2\text{CH}_2 = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2$	4.00E+13	0.000	0.
115.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{HCCO} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{CO}$	3.00E+13	0.000	0.
116.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{C}_3\text{H}_3 + \text{H}$	0.120E+14	0.000	6600.
117.	$\text{C}_4\text{H}_2 + \text{OH} = \text{C}_3\text{H}_2 + \text{HCO}$	0.666E+13	0.000	-410.
118.	$\text{C}_3\text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{HCO} + \text{HCCO}$	0.100E+14	0.000	0.
119.	$\text{C}_3\text{H}_3 + \text{O}_2 = \text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{HCO}$	0.300E+11	0.000	2868.
120.	$\text{C}_3\text{H}_3 + \text{O} = \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{C}_2\text{H}$	0.200E+14	0.000	0.
121.	$\text{C}_3\text{H}_3 + \text{OH} = \text{C}_3\text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	0.200E+14	0.000	0.
122.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{C}_4\text{H}_3 + \text{H}$	0.200E+13	0.000	45900.
123.	$\text{C}_4\text{H}_3 + \text{M} = \text{C}_4\text{H}_2 + \text{H} + \text{M}$	0.100E+17	0.000	59700.
124.	$\text{CH}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 = \text{C}_3\text{H}_3 + \text{H}$	3.000E+13	0.000	0.
125.	$\text{C}_4\text{H}_2 + \text{O} = \text{C}_3\text{H}_2 + \text{CO}$	1.200E+12	0.000	0.
126.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{HCCO} + \text{OH}$	2.00E+08	1.500	30100.
127.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{H} + \text{M}$	4.20E+16	0.000	107000.
128.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2 + \text{M}$	1.50E+15	0.000	55800.
129.	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{H} + \text{M}$	1.40E+16	0.000	82360.
130.	$\text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 = 2\text{OH}$	1.70E+13	0.000	47780.
131.	$\text{OH} + \text{H}_2 = \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{H}$	1.17E+09	1.300	3626.
132.	$\text{O} + \text{OH} = \text{O}_2 + \text{H}$	4.00E+14	-0.500	0.
133.	$\text{O} + \text{H}_2 = \text{OH} + \text{H}$	5.06E+04	2670	6290.
134.	$\text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{M} = \text{HO}_2 + \text{M}$ $\text{H}_2\text{O}/18.6/ \text{CO}_2/4.2/ \text{H}_2/2.9/ \text{CO}/2.1/ \text{N}_2/1.3/$	3.61E+17	-0.720	0.
135.	$\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2 = \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{O}_2$	7.50E+12	0.000	0.
136.	$\text{H} + \text{HO}_2 = \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{OH}$	1.40E+14	0.000	1073.
137.	$\text{O} + \text{HO}_2 = \text{O}_2 + \text{OH}$	1.40E+13	0.000	1073.
138.	$2\text{OH} = \text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	6.00E+08	1.300	0.
139.	$2\text{H} + \text{M} = \text{H}_2 + \text{M}$	1.00E+18	-1.000	0.
140.	$2\text{H} + \text{H}_2 = 2\text{H}_2$	9.20E+16	-0.600	0.
141.	$2\text{H} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	6.00E+19	-1.250	0.
142.	$2\text{H} + \text{CO}_2 = \text{H}_2 + \text{CO}_2$	5.49E+20	-2000	0.
143.	$\text{H} + \text{OH} + \text{M} = \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{M}$ $\text{H}_2\text{O}/5.0/$	1.60E+22	-2.000	0.
144.	$\text{H} + \text{O} + \text{M} = \text{OH} + \text{M}$ $\text{H}_2\text{O}/5.0/$	6.20E+16	-0.600	0.
145.	$2\text{O} + \text{M} = \text{O}_2 + \text{M}$	1.89E+13	0.000	-1788.
146.	$\text{H} + \text{HO}_2 = \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2$	1.25E+13	0.000	0.


147.	$2\text{HO}_2 = \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{O}_2$	2.00E+12	0.000	0.
148.	$\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{M} = 2\text{OH} + \text{M}$	1.30E+17	0.000	45500.
149.	$\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{H} = \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2$	1.60E+12	0.000	3800.
150.	$\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{OH} = \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{HO}_2$	1.00E+13	0.000	1800.
232.	$\text{N} + \text{NO} = \text{N}_2 + \text{O}$	0.327E+13	0.300	0.
233.	$\text{N} + \text{O}_2 = \text{NO} + \text{O}$	0.640E+10	1.000	6280.
234.	$\text{N} + \text{OH} = \text{NO} + \text{H}$	0.380E+14	0.000	0.
235.	$\text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{HO}_2 + \text{O}_2$	0.670E+20	-1.420	0.0

VITA

Daniel T. **Gottuk** was **born** on April **20, 1967** in Redbank, New Jersey. He graduated from Rumson-Fair Haven Regional **High** School in **1985** and moved South to attend Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Dan graduated Magna Cum Laude in **1989** with a **B.S.** in Mechanical Engineering. The same **year** he **married** Ruth E. Cooper.

As an undergraduate Dan worked on a flame diagnostic graduate research project, which sparked his interest in combustion. **So**, in August of **1989**, he began his graduate work in the area **of** fire science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Dan graduated with a Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering in **1992**.

After graduation, **Dan** is moving to Columbia, Maryland to work **as** a combustion research engineer for Hughes Associates, Inc. He is also eagerly awaiting the arrival of his first child in January **1993**.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Daniel T. Gottuk". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a solid horizontal line.

Daniel T. **Gottuk**

